



1979

Agency Structure, Target Populations, and Funding: An Analysis of Chicago's Private Social Services

Karen Hansen
Loyola University Chicago

Recommended Citation

Hansen, Karen, "Agency Structure, Target Populations, and Funding: An Analysis of Chicago's Private Social Services" (1979). *Master's Theses*. Paper 3099.
http://ecommons.luc.edu/luc_theses/3099

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the Theses and Dissertations at Loyola eCommons. It has been accepted for inclusion in Master's Theses by an authorized administrator of Loyola eCommons. For more information, please contact ecommons@luc.edu.



This work is licensed under a [Creative Commons Attribution-Noncommercial-No Derivative Works 3.0 License](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/3.0/).
Copyright © 1979 Karen Hansen

AGENCY STRUCTURE, TARGET POPULATIONS, AND
FUNDING: AN ANALYSIS OF CHICAGO'S
PRIVATE SOCIAL SERVICES

by

Karen S. Hansen

A Thesis Submitted to the Faculty of the Graduate School
of Loyola University of Chicago in Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree of

Master of Arts

November

1979

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Much gratitude is extended toward Dr. Kirsten Grønberg who helped me begin this project and guided me through much of it. Deep appreciation is extended to Dr. Judith Wittner who helped to polish the style of the manuscript, and guided me through the completion of the project.

I am indebted to the Chicago Office Donor's Forum. Their organizational files form the bulk of my data source.

Vita

The author, Karen Sue Hansen, is the daughter of Henry C. Hansen and M. Audrey (Wiemerslage) Hansen. She was born January 14, 1955 in Oak Park, Illinois.

Her elementary education was obtained in a private school in River Grove, Illinois, and secondary education at Mother Theodore Guerin High School in River Grove, Illinois where she graduated in 1973.

In September 1973, she entered Loyola University of Chicago, and in June, 1973 received the degree of Bachelor of Science with majors in psychology and sociology. While attending Loyola University, she was secretary of the Psychology Club in 1976 and 1977. She was elected a member of Blue Key National Honor Fraternity in 1977.

In May, 1977, she was granted a scholarship in sociology at Loyola University of Chicago. She is a candidate for the degree of Master of Arts in Sociology in January, 1979.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.....	ii
VITA.....	iii
LIST OF TABLES.....	v
INTRODUCTION.....	1
REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE.....	2
Parameters of Social Services.....	2
Coordination and Structure.....	4
Degree of Matching Between Target Populations, Needs, and Social Service Agencies.....	4
The Relations of Support.....	6
METHOD.....	12
The Data Source.....	12
The Questionnaire.....	13
Community Analysis Projects.....	15
RESULTS.....	17
Coordination and Structure.....	17
The Degree of Matching Between Social Services and Their Target Populations.....	36
The Relations of Financial Support.....	80
DISCUSSION.....	94
Complexity and Interdependence.....	94
Coordination and Structure.....	96
The Match Between Social Ser- vice Agencies and Their Tar- get Populations.....	98
The Relations of Financial Support.....	103
REFERENCES.....	107

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
1. Degree of Institutionalization by Type of Social Service.....	19
2. Percent of Agencies with Given Organizational Relations by Type of Social Service.....	22
3. Agency Percentages of Publication Orientation by Type of Social Service.....	27
4. Listings and Endorsements by Type of Social Service.....	29
5. Degree of Institutionalization by Service Region.....	32
6. Distribution of Types of Social Services.....	37
7. Organizational Orientations: Ethnic, Racial, and Religious Identity by Type of Social Service.....	47
8. Organizational Focus and Com- munity Characteristics: Ethnic, Racial, and Religious Identity by Region.....	51
9. Agency Orientation: Agency Percentages by Types of Social Services.....	59
10. Agency Orientations: Age by Regional Service Area.....	62
11. Agency Orientation: Religious Affiliation by Type of Social Service Percentages.....	66
12. Agency Orientation: Religious Affiliation Percentages by Service Region.....	69

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
13. Agency Focus: Problem Area Percent by Service Region.....	72
14. Social Services: The Popula- tion as a Whole, and the Pov- erty Population-An Index of Dissimilarity Summary.....	76
15. Funding Sources.....	80
16. Correlation Coefficients of Overall Income and Funding Proportions.....	83
17. Correlation Coefficients of Funding Reliance Proportions with Community Character- istics of the Area in Which the Agency is Located.....	86
18. Correlation Coefficients Between the Degree of Institutionalization of a Social Service Agency and the Degree of Reliance upon Various Sources of Funding.....	91

INTRODUCTION

THE DISTRIBUTION OF WELFARE AGENCIES IN CHICAGO

The purpose of the study presented here is to analyze the private social services in Chicago and their relations with funding sources, the degree of match between target populations and agency locations, and the structure and coordination of the agencies themselves. The relationship between agency location and target population, the degree of match, provides the most striking pattern found in this study.

The major finding of this study is that a great deal of maldistribution exists between agency location and potential target populations, particularly for poverty populations. This maldistribution may be a consequence of the tremendous concentration of private social service in the North Lakefront region. For those agencies which specify minority focus, there are differential degrees of match for the various minorities, with blacks demonstrating between population proportions of service regions and agency locations of all minorities.

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

Parameters of Social Services

In this essay, a basic question is, What is included within the categories of social welfare and social services? The boundaries of this area appear to be quite extensive. Pearce and Street define social welfare institutions as "a heterogeneous, uneven, poorly founded collection of programs, personnel, and practices...(Pearce and Street 1978 , p. 1). Two major points can help to delimit these otherwise wide boundaries: Social services are essential to modern society (Vaid 1975-1976, p. 377). Social services deal with social problems. Freeman indicates that these problems can be broken down into two major categories: pervasive problems (which usually deal with problems of disadvantage such as poverty); and problems specific to the life cycle (such as old age, adolescence, and childhood dependency) (Freeman and Jones 1973, Table of Contents).

Issues of Complexity and Interdependence among the Social Services

In order to understand the relationships between the American welfare system and private social welfare services, it is necessary to recognize that the American social welfare system is a loosely structured system of services characterized by a great deal of overlap and fragmentation.

The research reported here is an attempt to describe private social services in Chicago within this framework. Recognizing this reality will help to explain more completely the organization of Chicago based private social services, their complexities and interrelationships, which is the goal of this study.

The system of social welfare is complex, ill defined, and locally organized (Pearce and Street, 1978, p. 2). Another characteristic of the American social welfare system is its ad hoc tendencies (Karl 1976, p. 130), in that it is oriented toward curative, not preventive services (Bremner 1972, p. 266).

Vaid determines that resources and social definitions of need define the upper limits of social services, while the lower limit is determined by that level deemed necessary for human life (Vaid 1975-1976, p. 377). Within this framework, there exists a potential for a great deal of ambiguity. Greenley suggests that welfare programs are organized around perceptions of need, not upon the basis of actual client problems (Greenley 1973, p. 78). Furthermore, policies are reactive, addressing problems only as they unfold (Vaid 1975-1976, p. 377).

Nationally, the American social welfare system includes a wide variety of racial, ethnic, and religious orientations, and competing minority groups (Wilensky 1975, p. xvii). It is politically decentralized (Wilensky 1975 p. xvii), and emphasizes privatized familial responsibility

(Karl 1976, p. 130).

Coordination and Structure

How do private social services fit within this framework of localized fragmentation, overlapping jurisdiction, and interdependence? Pearce and Street propose that there is a continued tendency toward consolidation and coordination, especially in regard to funding (Pearce and Street 1978, p. 19-20). Jones maintains that competition for public funding leads to coordination strategies between agencies in order that they might maximize their control over increasingly scarce resources (Jones 1975, p. 375). The extent of interdependence between agencies is one of the critical issues in this study.

The Degree of Match Between Target Populations, Needs, and Social Services Offered

The most basic research issue of this study is the degree of match between the individual Chicago based social service agencies and their clients' needs. The ecological distribution of the social services provides one method for analyzing the degree of match between the social services provided and the population characteristics of the community in which the social service agency is located. Pearce and Street find that there are "striking but complicated patterns of differentiation in the location of clientele, personnel, facilities and programs (Pearce and Street 1978, p. 2) The geographical dispersion of this data support the findings of Pearce and Street.

Pearce and Street conclude that the secularization of sponsorship of social service agencies reflects the decline of white ethnicity as a social force (Pearce and Street 1978, p. 28). The data within this study do not lend themselves to speculations about the decline of religious sponsorship of these particular social services, although they do indicate certain regional patterns in the religious affiliations of the agencies. Specifically, the three denominations examined, Catholic, Protestant, and Jewish tend to concentrate their affiliated social services within the North Side of Chicago. South Side social services with religious affiliations are most likely to be Protestant.

Pearce and Street find a decline in the proportion of social services catering to specific populations (Pearce and Street 1978, p. 26). The data within this study support this finding: less than one half of the agencies specify particular racial, ethnic, or age preferences. Those that do indicate preferences for particular types of clients are often located far from their proposed target populations.

Pearce and Street show evidence of dramatic withdrawals of social service agencies within certain regions (Pearce and Street 1978, p. 32). The data within this study are not longitudinal, and therefore do not lend themselves directly to speculations about such trends. Nonetheless, the data do indicate striking patterns of underrepresentation of social services on Chicago's South Side. This may be linked to the comparatively high proportion of poor blacks on Chi-

cago's South Side. Although Pearce and Street's speculation is that suburban resistance to welfare institutions will lead to a concentration of "problematic welfare facilities in the less defended areas of the central city" (Pearce and Street 1978, p. 6), the patterns found within the present study do not support this showing in that it finds that the poorer, less well defended neighborhoods within the city of Chicago are lacking in private social services.

As Cloward argues, historically the social services have been distributed to clients based on the logic of attempting to serve those in greatest need. However, he concludes that this tendency has disappeared among the private social services as the neediest segment of the population has been abandoned by private social services (Cloward and Epstein 1965, pp. 625-626). Lowi indicates that the public assistance rolls have shifted toward the least influential and neediest (Lowi 1969, p. 229). The data within this study support Lowi's thesis: There are disproportionately few private social services in the poorest neighborhoods within the city of Chicago. Possibly the public agencies within these areas deal with the pervasive problems of poverty. Regardless, the data do indicate an absence of private social services within the hardcore pockets of poverty within the city.

The Relations of Support Among the Private Social Services

Another basic research issue concerns the relationships of financial support. The funding relationships examined are those regarding the degree of match between

services and clients, the public's willingness to support different welfare groups, patterns of support, and the extent of reliance upon particular sources of income. An important question concerns the degree of match of the social services and their clients. Such support varies by the types of services provided and the types of clients served. The importance of the support relations is their contribution to the context of the social service system which then provides the theoretical background helping to provide explanations for the findings generated by the present study.

In its support, Cook found the Chicago area population to be fairly homogeneous concerning different social welfare services (Cook 1979, p. 166). Although her findings indicate that the public does differentiate among welfare groups based upon reflections about the special needs of the welfare groups and appropriate services to fit the needs of these groups, such differentiation appears to be fairly standard across different population groups. Cook proposes three possible reasons for the discrimination among the Chicago public: 1. A concern with whether the program's structure will permit it to meet the essential needs of the welfare group; 2. The possibility that the public hopes to maximize individual independence; and 3. Whether there are alternative sources of help which could provide the services for a particular program (Cook 1979, p. 158). Later the discussion will focus on the degree to which sources of support emphasize workfare types of programs, presumably in the

hopes of maximizing independence, plus the degree to which public and private funds and public and private social service programs are perceived as being alternatives to each other.

Cook's data indicate preferences toward certain welfare groups in expressions of public support. She advances the notion that the public's willingness to support a particular welfare group is based upon the particular welfare services linked to that group. Support preferences appear to be dependent upon many factors: 1. The respondent's level of belief in a just world; 2. The likelihood that the respondent will at some time suffer from the welfare group's plight; 3. The percentage of the respondents who know someone in the same plight as that of the welfare group, 4. Whether the respondent had ever received assistance from the government; 5. The perceived need of the welfare group; 6. The perceived deservingness of the welfare group; 8. The perceived gratefulness of the welfare group; and 9. The degree to which the welfare group is perceived as being responsible for its own fare, (Cook 1979, p. 168). The public appears to be least supportive of services for the working age populations, with the exception of educational services (Cook 1979, p. 163). There is some support for this argument in the present study which shows a mild positive relation between the percentage of unemployment in an area in which a social service agency is located and the extent to which

agencies rely upon funding agencies, rather than upon, for example, private donations or public funds. Funding agencies, particularly the community chest type, actively solicit funds from the public. The pattern indicated here may reflect an attempt to maximize independence within these areas.

As Marmor indicates, it is important to examine the aged distribution in relation to the social services, because it is not subject to sudden shifts. The elderly of the year 2000 are presently alive. As the proportion of elderly increase, they will be drawing proportionately more upon the social services. Cook's data indicate that the elderly are preferred as a support group over children. She links this fact to the issues of perceived gratefulness, deservingness, and need on the part of this welfare group. The poor elderly are also preferred as a welfare group over the adults who are under sixty-five years of age and poor, and this is linked to their perceived deservingness, and also their being perceived as less responsible for their own fate (Cook 1979, p. 138). The data of this study indicate that there is a slight preference for the elderly in terms of funding for those agencies located in areas with high proportions of senior citizens. This is particularly true for private sources of income and income from a funding agency. Interestingly, the data indicate that agencies located in areas which have large proportions of senior citizens in poverty are not likely to rely upon income from any of the sources within this study.

The conclusion which can be drawn from the above discussion, which will be more fully discussed later is that there is no clearcut relationship between the degree of match between the clients' needs and services provided, and funding. Financial support tends to vary, and may well not follow any particularly logical pattern. Elling suggests that sponsorship of some social services varies, leaving some agencies associated with the elements of the community which may have varying abilities to channel support to the organization (Elling 1965, p. 330). This conforms to a pattern indicated within the present study, those areas of greatest need are particularly reliant upon forms of income from outside the agency itself.

Patterns of public and private support tend to become blurred as there exists a very fine line between the two. Public funding is frequently channeled into private social service agencies in the form of fees for services, public contracts, and grants. This appears to be the case for a very large proportion of Chicago's private social services.

Pearce and Street's data indicate patterns of heavy reliance upon the contributions and fees and dues (Pearce and Street 1978, p. 28). The findings generated by this sample indicate a much greater reliance upon outside generated income than do their data. Additionally, the data indicate a much lower reliance upon fees and dues. This is particularly true in areas of the city with large proportions of potentially dependent populations, but it is also typical of

the city as a whole. The conclusion which may be drawn here is that the data within this study indicate a greater degree of dependence than is found in the Pearce and Street study, and correspondingly, much less self reliance.

METHOD

The Data Source

The data for this study were collected during June and July of 1978. The six hundred twenty-three cases are a selected sample of the population of the private philanthropic social service agencies listed with the Donor's Forum Organizational Files.¹ The main data source, the Donor's Forum is a nonprofit organization, the regional office of the Foundation Center in New York, and it maintains files on private philanthropic social service agencies.²

¹All organizations not having a Chicago Address, or not providing social services were eliminated from the organizations listed with the Donor's Forum. This provided the basis for the sample.

²Approximately two thirds of the agencies within this sample were listed directly with the Donor's Forum. One third were generated through their connections with agencies listed in the Donor's Forum Organizational Files. An example here would be an umbrella organization filing one questionnaire on behalf of several other agencies. The names of the smaller agencies were then located in either the Social Services Directory, or in the Chicago Telephone Directory. When information was unavailable for a variable, the agency was either assigned a score on that variable based on the information gleaned about the larger organization, for those agencies in which it seemed logical to assume that the smaller agencies would necessarily share the same attributes as the larger umbrella organization, such as federation members, and religious affiliation. In all other cases, the variables were coded as having missing information for that particular agency.

Agencies voluntarily file with this agency by answering a mailed questionnaire. In addition, agency folders may also include other materials, such as financial statements, Contributor's Bulletins (excerpts from the Chicago Association of Commerce and Industry publications), newsclippings, brochures, and other organizational literature.

Most of the material for this study comes from the questionnaire, of which two versions exist. At the time of the data collection, the newest version of the Donor's Forum questionnaire had eliminated two questions that had been included in the earlier version. This limits comparability, but not seriously.

The Questionnaire

The following data are available from the questionnaire: The organization's name, phone number, address, purpose, budget, year of founding, tax status, whether the organization is a local chapter of a national agency, and the number of paid staff. The questionnaire also furnishes information about the number of directors and the number of executive committee members, plus the number of annual meetings of these two groups. The questionnaire also contains information on the number of branch offices, the number of affiliates, whether the agency publishes an annual report, newsletter or other forms of literature, the date of the current report, the target population, and the IRS code.

The following data from other sources are added to

the information provided by the questionnaire: whether the organization is endorsed by other agencies,³ whether the agency utilizes volunteer services,⁴ and agency affiliations with religious organizations.⁵ This portion of the data set provides for fifty-seven variables. To this data set are added various characteristics and demographic information concerning the particular community area in which each agency is located.⁶

³Endorsements were found in several ways: Agencies include within their folder indications of which organizations gave them endorsements. (This was the primary method for coding the agencies endorsed by the Metropolitan Council for Community Services.) The Chicago Association of Commerce and Industry publishes its endorsements, and agencies were assigned the association's endorsement, regardless of whether or not they had mentioned this endorsement themselves. The term endorsement is a misapplication when applied to the Social Services Directory. Being listed by the Social Services Directory does not indicate endorsement. Therefore, this category is actually an indication of which agencies are listed with the Social Services Directory.

⁴In order to determine whether agencies utilized volunteer services, the folders were inspected to determine whether or not this information was available. This information was given in fifty-five cases, a very small proportion of the sample. Therefore, this variable was dropped from subsequent analysis.

⁵Religious affiliations were determined through whatever information was available within the folder, such as newsclippings or agency brochures. It is believed that since nearly one half the organizations within this sample indicate having religious affiliations, that this is a fairly accurate reflection of the total number of religiously affiliated agencies.

⁶All information within this sample which concerns community characteristics and demographic distributions is from the United States Census, 1970.

This includes information on the age distribution, educational and income levels, racial and ethnic proportions, employment percentages, and income sources for each respective case. This information accounts for another forty-nine variables. Therefore, the total number of variables within this data set gleaned directly from the data is one hundred six. There are ninety-five computed variables, based upon these direct variables. The total number of variables within this data set, including the number of computed variables is two hundred one variables. Roughly eighty percent of these variables are utilized in the data manipulations, and approximately one half are discussed in some degree within the data analysis section of this study.

Community Analysis Projects

Based on the service categories provided by the United Way's Community Analysis Projects, a service typology of sixteen categories was created. The Community Analysis Projects divide the city of Chicago into seventeen service regions. For the purpose of this study, these are regrouped into sixteen regions.⁷

⁷The O'Hare region was combined with the Far North West Region because the two demonstrate similarity in racial distributions, economic information, and educational levels. They are geographically adjacent to each other. The underlying reason for this combination is that the O'Hare region is very small, and contains no social service agencies. Considering these factors, it is believed that very little mischief was done to the data.

The data, with very few exceptions, is quite recent. Nearly sixty percent of the data is from the period 1977-1978. Nearly forty percent of the data is from the 1975-1976 period.

RESULTS

Coordination and Structure of the Social Service Agencies

In order to measure the degree of bureaucratized establishment of the social service agencies, a variable called the degree of institutionalization was created, comprised of weighted factors of several other variables.¹ The results of this analysis are shown in Table 1. The variable was subsequently divided into three levels of degrees of institutionalization, with approximately even proportions of agencies in each category.

Certain social services, such as those focusing on housing, employment, education, community advocacy, and civic and cultural affairs tend to have concentrations of agencies within the low and medium categories. The ser-

¹The degree of institutionalization is based upon a weighted combination of the following variables: Tax status, federation member, federation head, the number of branch offices, the number of affiliates, whether the agency is a local chapter of a national organization, whether the agency publishes an annual report, a newsletter, or other publications, the founding date for that particular agency, whether the agency is listed in the Social Services Directory, whether the agency is endorsed by the Chicago Association of Commerce and Industry, whether the agency is endorsed by the Metropolitan Council for Community Services, plus the size of the organizations' budgets.

vices concerned with basic needs and consumer issues appear to have a medium degree of institutionalization. Those agencies which are dispersed within the high degrees of institutionalization are those dealing with physical health, and family substitution. This may well be expected since it is likely that these agencies represent hospitals, childcare institutions, and adoption agencies, which can be expected to exhibit a high degree of institutionalization, in part because they are legally required to adhere to certain standards of operation. Two services appear to have medium to high concentrations of degrees of institutionalization: socialization and rehabilitation. The relatively high degrees of institutionalization might be accounted for in two ways: 1. Rehabilitation centers have fairly stringent supervisory standards, and these organizational tendencies may well lend themselves to advancing a certain degree of institutionalization; 2. A sizeable proportion of the socialization agencies within this sample are operated, and/or funded by, and/or affiliated with the Jewish welfare services. Being closely affiliated with a bureaucratic organization might well tend to strengthen institutionalization tendencies within the individual agencies.

A great deal of variance in institutionalization exists with respect to those services oriented to families and community advocacy. It is possible that the reason for this dispersion is that these two agencies contain many diverse services, and therefore, many varying degrees of insti-

TABLE 1

DEGREE OF INSTITUTIONALIZATION BY TYPE OF SERVICE

Type of Agency	Low	Medium	High	Row Total
Consumer	0.0 (0.0)	100.0 (0.5)	0.0 (0.0)	0.2
Employment	41.4 (6.1)	35.7 (4.6)	17.9 (2.6)	4.6
Basic Needs	7.1 (0.5)	71.4 (4.6)	21.4 (1.5)	2.3
Housing	60.0 (4.2)	26.7 (1.9)	13.3 (1.0)	2.3
Mental Health	53.3 (3.8)	40.0 (2.8)	6.7 (0.5)	2.4
Sustenance Abuse	26.7 (1.9)	40.0 (2.8)	33.0 (2.6)	2.4
Physical Health	32.1 (4.2)	21.4 (2.8)	46.6 (2.6)	2.8
Mental Retardation	38.9 (3.3)	50.0 (4.2)	11.1 (1.0)	2.9
Rehabilitation	0.0 (0.0)	50.0 (1.4)	50.0 (1.5)	1.0
Educational	44.9 (10.3)	30.6 (6.9)	24.5 (6.2)	8.0
Family	28.5 (21.1)	32.3 (32.6)	39.2 (32.0)	25.6
Family Substitution	10.0 (1.4)	26.7 (3.7)	63.3 (9.8)	4.9
Socialization	9.4 (2.8)	57.8 (17.1)	32.8 (10.8)	10.4

TABLE 1

DEGREE OF INSTITUTIONALIZATION BY TYPE OF SERVICE

Type of Agency	Low	Medium	High	Row Total
Community Advocacy	46.6 (39.0)	27.5 (22.7)	25.8 (32.7)	27.7
Civic and Cultural	75.0 (1.4)	25.0 (0.5)	0.0 (0.0)	0.7
Column Total	213 * 34.2 (100.0)	216 * 34.7 (100.0)	194 * 31.1 (100.0)	623 * 100.0 (100.0)

* Indicates categorical percentages of the total number of cases.

** Parenthesized figures are column percentages.

tutionalization accompanying the various services. Sustenance abuse also displays a wide dispersion over the three levels of institutionalization, although this type of service is usually broken down into three types of services: counseling, residences for abusers, and halfway houses for former abusers. Perhaps the emphasis of the particular agency in some way determines the degree of institutionalization which that particular agency displays.

Table 2 indicates the relationships between the agencies, and to some extent, as in the case of the chapter member category, relationships to agencies outside the city of Chicago. To a fairly discernable extent, the relationships indicated within this particular table tend to support the conclusions reached by the earlier table. Most agencies within this sample appear to display some type of linkage to each other. The most popular type of linkage would seem to be that of affiliation, with over three quarters of the social service agencies being affiliated in some way with at least one other agency. The next most popular type of linkage is that of the federation member, which represents nearly seventy-five percent of the agencies within this data set.

A very small number of the social service agencies within this data set are federation heads. This is to be expected, for this type of category is necessarily limited to representing a smaller number of cases. This same limitation applies to the small number of cases within the chapter members category. Most of the local chapters within this sample

TABLE 2

PERCENT OF AGENCIES WITH GIVEN ORGANIZATIONAL RELATIONS

BY TYPE OF SOCIAL SERVICE

Type of Agency	Chapter Member	Branch Offices	Federation Member	Federation Head	Affiliation
Consumer	100.0 (1.1)	0.0 (0.0)	0.0 (0.0)	0.0 (0.0)	100.0 (0.2)
Employment	14.3 (4.0)	64.3 (4.2)	78.6 (4.7)	0.0 (0.0)	82.1 (4.8)
Basic Needs	14.3 (2.3)	85.7 (2.8)	92.9 (2.8)	0.0 (0.0)	85.7 (2.5)
Housing	6.7 (1.1)	46.7 (1.6)	40.0 (1.3)	0.0 (0.0)	60.0 (1.9)
Mental Health	0.0 (0.0)	60.0 (2.1)	60.0 (1.9)	6.7 (3.4)	66.7 (2.1)
Sustenance Abuse	6.7 (1.1)	60.0 (2.1)	73.3 (2.4)	13.3 (6.9)	53.3 (1.7)
Physical Health	28.6 (8.5)	57.1 (3.7)	57.1 (3.4)	0.0 (0.0)	60.7 (3.6)
Mental Retardation	11.1 (2.1)	55.6 (3.4)	77.8 (3.0)	5.6 (3.4)	88.9 (3.4)
Rehabilitation	33.3 (2.1)	16.7 (0.2)	50.0 (0.6)	0.0 (0.0)	33.3 (0.4)

TABLE 2

PERCENT OF AGENCIES WITH GIVEN ORGANIZATIONAL RELATIONS

BY TYPE OF SOCIAL SERVICE

Type of Agency	Chapter Member	Branch Offices	Federation Member	Federation Head	Affiliation
Educational	16.3 (8.5)	65.3 (7.5)	71.4 (7.5)	2.0 (3.4)	73.5 (7.5)
Family	9.5 (16.0)	85.4 (31.6)	87.3 (29.7)	3.8 (20.7)	88.0 (29.1)
Family Substitution	46.7 (14.9)	93.3 (6.6)	93.3 (6.0)	0.0 (0.0)	93.3 (5.9)
Socialization	28.1 (19.1)	89.1 (13.3)	90.6 (12.5)	7.8 (17.2)	89.1 (11.9)
Community Advocacy	10.1 (19.1)	51.7 (21.5)	61.2 (23.5)	7.3 (44.8)	61.2 (22.9)
Civic and Cultural	0.0 (0.0)	25.0 (0.9)	50.0 (0.4)	0.0 (0.0)	25.0 (0.2)
Column Total	94 15.1* (100.0)	427 68.5* (100.0)	464 74.5* (100.0)	29 4.7* (100.0)	477 76.6* (100.0)

* Indicates categorical percentages calculated from total.

TABLE 2

PERCENT OF AGENCIES WITH GIVEN ORGANIZATIONAL RELATIONS
BY TYPE OF SOCIAL SERVICE

** Parenthesized figures indicate column percentages.

*** Because any given organization may belong to more than one category, it is not expected that the row percentages will necessarily add up to 100.0 percent.

are concerned with global medical problems, such as treatment, research, and/or fund raising. Since many social services deal with local problems, thus tending to be regionally specific, it is natural that a relatively smaller proportion of agencies would be local chapters of a national organization. A substantial proportion of the agencies do have branch offices, nearly seventy percent. This raw number of four hundred twenty-seven agencies is quite impressive considering the total number of cases within the sample is six hundred twenty-three agencies. What appears to be happening within this sample is some process of decentralization, which seems to have taken over, and that the agencies are listing each other as branch offices, which probably tends to over inflate the actual proportion of branch offices.

Publication of printed material is also included in the degree of institutionalization measure. From Table 3, it would appear that many, approximately one third of the agencies tend to produce one or more types of publications. The most popular form is the annual report, which accounts for nearly sixty percent of the total number of agencies which do put forth publications. Possibly an annual report is considered important for contributors to be able to make a judgement about the worthiness of the agency. The fact that forty percent are not publishing an annual report may possibly indicate less reliance upon various contributed forms of income for these agencies. Nearly forty percent of the publication oriented agencies put forth a newsletter,

TABLE 3

AGENCY PERCENTAGES OF PUBLICATION ORIENTATIONS
BY TYPE OF SOCIAL SERVICE

Type of Agency	Annual Report	Newsletter	Other Publication
Consumer	100.0 (0.4)	100.0 (0.4)	0.0 (0.0)
Employment	67.9 (5.4)	25.0 (2.9)	17.9 (2.3)
Basic Needs	78.6 (3.1)	28.6 (1.6)	14.3 (0.9)
Housing	46.7 (2.0)	33.3 (2.0)	20.0 (1.4)
Mental Health	40.0 (1.7)	13.3 (2.8)	33.3 (0.3)
Sustenance Abuse	26.7 (1.1)	40.0 (2.5)	53.3 (3.7)
Physical Health	64.3 (5.1)	39.3 (4.5)	21.4 (2.8)
Mentally Retarded	16.7 (0.8)	22.2 (1.6)	66.7 (5.6)
Rehabilitation	50.0 (0.8)	50.0 (1.2)	33.3 (0.9)
Educational	51.0 (7.1)	42.9 (8.6)	40.8 (9.3)
Family	55.1 (24.6)	38.6 (25.0)	36.1 (26.4)
Family Substitute	73.3 (6.2)	50.0 (6.1)	53.3 (7.4)
Socialization	84.4 (15.3)	32.8 (8.6)	31.3 (9.3)

TABLE 3

AGENCY PERCENTAGES OF PUBLICATION ORIENTATIONS
BY TYPE OF SOCIAL SERVICE

Type of Agency	Annual Report	Newsletter	Other Publication
Community Advocacy	51.7 (26.0)	45.5 (33.2)	33.1 (27.3)
Civic and Cultural	50.0 (0.6)	50.0 (0.8)	25.0 (0.5)
Column Total	354 56.8* (100.0)	244 39.3* (100.0)	216 34.7* (100.0)

* Indicates categorical percentages calculated from the total number of cases.

** Parenthesized figures indicate column percentages.

*** Because the categories are not mutually exclusive, it is not expected that the rows will necessarily add up to 100.0 percent.

while nearly thirty-five percent of the agencies do tend to produce printed materials of other types.

A point might be made here that to some extent, newsletters and annual reports might well be substitutes for each other in some agencies, and therefore, would be most likely to occur in either one or the other. The agencies which reflect this pattern include: rehabilitation, education, community advocacy, and civic and cultural. It is notable that two types of agencies, physical health and family oriented services, follow the overall pattern the nearly sixty-fourty percent split with regard to annual reports and newsletters. This may reflect certain levels of the degree of institutionalization, in that these types of agencies are likely to be hospitals, or family oriented agencies administered through a major administrative headquarters. Being a portion of a bureaucratic organization might well tend to increase the inclination to publish annual reports.

Socialization, employment, basic needs, and consumer agencies all tend to place heavy emphasis on the annual report. This may well reflect the fact that with the exception of socialization, these agencies perform fairly concretized services, and thus their accomplishments lend themselves quite conveniently to the production of annual reports. Nearly all the socialization agencies within this sample tend to be individual services of a larger social welfare concern, and this would probably increase the likelihood that either they themselves or the umbrella association with which they

are affiliated would accept the responsibility to produce an annual report.

It is important to remember that publications, of any sort, tend to serve a dual purpose. They serve as a printed communication about the agency and its services. In addition, they also perform a public relations role, reporting accomplishments and indications of program expenses to contributors and to potential contributors. Approximately one third of the agencies do not publish any formal printed material. This may indicate less reliance upon outside generated income, a lack of funds sufficient to cover the cost of publication, or a perception on the part of the agencies that such publications would not increase the probability of obtaining additional income from outside sources, or possibly some combination of these factors.

Another facet of the degree of institutionalization of any particular social service agencies is the issue of who, among the many potential umbrella organizations lends its endorsement to the agency. Table 4 indicates that two thirds of the total number of social services are endorsed by or listed by the three endorsement agencies. The most popular form of acknowledgement is the listing within the Social Service Directory.² Nearly ninety percent of the endorsed or

²What is actually named as endorsement is whether the agency is listed within the directory, and this is not indicative of an endorsement, according to the Social Services Directory. It is treated as an endorsement for the purpose of data analysis, since there must exist criterion in listing.

TABLE 4

LISTINGS AND ENDORSEMENTS BY TYPE OF
SOCIAL SERVICES

Type of Agency	Social Ser- vices Dir- ectory List- ing	Chicago Asso- ciation of Commerce and Industry	Metropoli- tan Council for Commu- nity Services
Consumer	100.0 (0.2)	0.0 (0.0)	0.0 (0.0)
Employment	89.3 (4.6)	64.3 (4.1)	64.3 (4.3)
Basic Needs	92.9 (2.4)	92.9 (3.0)	92.9 (3.1)
Housing	66.7 (1.9)	60.0 (2.1)	33.3 (1.2)
Mental Health	80.0 (2.2)	40.0 (1.4)	40.0 (1.4)
Sustenance Abuse	100.0 (2.8)	66.7 (2.3)	73.3 (2.6)
Physical Health	78.6 (4.1)	64.3 (4.1)	67.9 (4.5)
Mental Retardation	100.0 (3.3)	83.3 (3.5)	88.9 (3.8)
Rehabilitation	100.0 (1.4)	100.0 (1.4)	66.7 (1.0)
Education	85.7 (7.8)	59.2 (6.7)	55.1 (6.5)
Family	95.6 (28.0)	83.5 (30.4)	83.5 (31.6)
Family Substitution	100.0 (5.6)	90.0 (6.2)	93.3 (6.7)

TABLE 4

LISTINGS AND ENDORSEMENTS BY TYPE OF
SOCIAL SERVICES

Type of Agency	Social Ser- vices Dir- ectory List- ing	Chicago Asso- ciation of Commerce and Industry	Metropoli- tan Council for Comun- ity Services
Socialization	93.8 (11.1)	89.1 (13.1)	85.9 (13.2)
Community Advocacy	75.3 (42.8)	52.2 (21.4)	47.2 (20.1)
Civic and Cultural	25.0 (0.2)	25.0 (0.2)	0.0 (0.0)
Column Total	450 86.7* (100.0)	434 69.7* (100.0)	418 67.1* (100.0)

* Indicates categorical percentages calculated from total.

** Parenthesized figures indicate column percentages.

*** Because the categories are not mutually exclusive, it is not expected that the row percentages would necessarily add up to 100.0 percent.

listed agencies carried a Social Services Directory listing. The Chicago Association of Commerce and Industry and the Metropolitan Council for Community Services each endorse a hefty seventy percent of the agencies bearing endorsements.

A goodly proportion of the agencies tend to reflect the pattern produced by the marginal totals. The figures do indicate a great deal of overlapping of endorsements in areas such as basic needs, rehabilitation, and family substitution. While the relationship between consumer agencies and listing with the Social Services Directory would appear to be an impressive one, it should be remembered that there is only one consumer service within this sample. Similarly, it is unjustifiable to draw any conclusions about the relationships between civic and cultural agencies and their endorsements because of the small number of cases within the civic and cultural category ($N=4$).

Interesting patterns tend to appear when considering the relationship between the location of the agency, and the degree of institutionalization associated with the agency. Table 5 indicates a fairly even three way split between the low, medium, and high levels of the degree of institutionalization. The area known as the north lakefront reflects the total picture most accurately, which can be attributed to the fact that the north lakefront contains over one half of the number of the city's total number of social service agencies.

Certain service regions tend to have their agencies

TABLE 5

DEGREE OF INSTITUTIONALIZATION PERCENTAGES BY
SERVICE REGIONS

Service Region	Low	Medium	High	Row Total
Far North West	24.1 (3.3)	55.2 (7.4)	20.7 (3.1)	4.7
Far North Center	25.0 (0.9)	62.5 (2.3)	12.5 (0.5)	1.3
North Lakefront	34.7 (55.9)	34.7 (55.1)	30.6 (54.1)	55.1
North Central	22.4 (5.2)	46.9 (10.6)	30.6 (7.7)	7.9
North West	0.0 (0.0)	100.0 (0.5)	0.0 (0.0)	0.2
Far West	52.0 (6.1)	24.0 (2.8)	24.0 (3.1)	4.0
Near West	21.4 (5.6)	35.7 (9.3)	42.9 (12.4)	9.0
Mid-South Lakefront	33.3 (4.7)	26.7 (3.7)	40.0 (6.2)	4.8
Mid-South Central	54.5 (5.6)	18.2 (1.9)	27.3 (3.1)	3.5
Mid-South West	25.0 (0.9)	37.5 (1.4)	37.5 (1.5)	1.3
South West	25.0 (0.9)	37.5 (1.4)	37.5 (1.5)	1.3
South Central East	40.0 (2.8)	26.7 (1.9)	33.3 (2.6)	2.4
South East	77.8 (3.3)	0.0 (0.0)	22.2 (1.0)	1.4

TABLE 5

DEGREE OF INSTITUTIONALIZATION PERCENTAGES BY
SERVICE REGIONS

Service Region	Low	Medium	High	Row Total
Far South Central	50.0 (2.8)	25.0 (1.4)	25.0 (1.5)	1.9
Far South West	33.3 (0.5)	33.3 (0.5)	33.3 (0.5)	0.5
Column Total	213 34.2* (100.0)	216 34.7* (100.0)	194 31.1* (100.0)	623 100.0* (100.0)

* Indicates categorical percentages calculated from the total number of agencies.

** Parenthesized figures are column percentages.

concentrated within the medium level of degree of institutionalization. These areas are the Far North West, Far North Center, North Central, and especially the North West. With the exception of the North West, these other areas tend to have smaller but substantial proportions in the other levels of degrees of institutionalization. These areas tend to house predominantly white nonminority status persons. The exception to the nonminority status is located within the North Center which houses a large proportion of Hispanic persons. This area also tends to be an economically depressed area, especially in contrast to the more well to do nonHispanic areas. Since only two areas tend to have their agencies concentrated in high levels of degrees of institutionalization, these actually represent, for the most part, the higher levels of degrees of institutionalization. Therefore, perhaps a case may be made for the agencies located in the areas with higher socioeconomic status having relatively higher degrees of institutionalization. As will be noted later on, the Hispanic Americans may well be the up and coming minority group, and therefore, may tend to accrue more benefits from private welfare than do other minority groups. This may help to partially explain why areas with high proportions of Spanish-Americans would also contain higher proportions of agencies with comparatively higher proportions of degrees of institutionalization. More support for this theoretical argument comes from the fact that the area Mid-South Lakefront tends to have its agencies concentrated within the higher levels of the degrees

of institutionalization. Although this area does contain substantial pockets of poverty, it is generally acknowledged to be a relatively well to do area.

The poor areas of the city tend to be concentrated on the South Side of the city. These areas have high proportions of blacks within their populations. The agencies located in these areas display relatively lower levels of degrees of institutionalization. The exception to this pattern is in the area known as Far South West. This area is in a relatively high socioeconomic bracket, and has very small proportions of minority groups. The pattern within this area repeats the pattern for the city as a whole, with an even three way split.

In summary, the major points of this section are: Those social services which deal with poverty related issues are more likely to be characterized by lower degrees of institutionalization, examples being housing and employment. Those social services which deal with problems of childcare and physical health are more likely to be characterized by higher degrees of institutionalization. Most agencies tend to be linked to each other, especially through affiliations or federations. Approximately two thirds of the social service agencies produce some formal publication which indicate a public relations attempt to solicit outside funding and/or the performance of concretized social services lending themselves to literary description. Approximately two thirds of the agencies hold endorsements. The degree of overlap between endorsements may indicate that endorsement agencies utilize

similar criteria in assessing agencies, and/or the granting of one endorsement may assist in an agency's obtaining other endorsements. Agencies located on the North Side tend to display higher degrees of institutionalization than do agencies located in the poorer black regions of the South Side.

Matching Between the Social Service agencies and Their Target Populations

Table 6 indicates a fair amount of geographic dispersion among the various types of social services. Generally, the individual areas tend to follow the main pattern of the city. Family services and community agencies appear to be overrepresented within the total scheme, each accounting for roughly one quarter of the total number of social service agencies. The remainder of the types of social service agencies show considerably smaller proportions. The former two types of social services cover a broad spectrum of services, which could make them likely candidates to hold the greatest percentage of the total number of social services.

The North Lakefront stands out from the other service regions in that it contains a disproportionate number of social service agencies, relative to the other regions. Over one half the city's total number of social services are located within this one area. This is not surprising in light of two facts: First, this region contains the most people of any service region in Chicago. Second, and more importantly, this region contains the Loop area of the city,

TABLE 6

DISTRIBUTION OF TYPES OF SOCIAL SERVICES BY SERVICE REGION

Type of Agency	Far North West	Far North Center	North Lakefront	North Cen- tral	North West	Far West
Consumer	0.0 (0.0)	0.0 (0.0)	100.0 (0.3)	0.0 (0.0)	0.0 (0.0)	0.0 (0.0)
Employment	0.0 (0.0)	0.0 (0.0)	53.6 (4.4)	7.1 (4.1)	0.0 (0.0)	0.0 (0.0)
Basic Needs	0.0 (0.0)	0.0 (0.0)	85.7 (3.5)	7.1 (7.1)	0.0 (0.0)	0.0 (0.0)
Housing Services	0.0 (0.0)	0.0 (0.0)	80.0 (3.5)	6.7 (2.0)	0.0 (0.0)	0.0 (0.0)
Mental Health	6.7 (3.4)	0.0 (0.0)	60.0 (2.6)	13.3 (4.1)	0.0 (0.0)	0.0 (0.0)
Sustenance Abuse	0.0 (0.0)	0.0 (0.0)	60.0 (2.6)	13.3 (4.1)	0.0 (0.0)	0.0 (0.0)
Physical Health	7.1 (6.9)	0.0 (0.0)	50.0 (4.1)	14.3 (8.2)	0.0 (0.0)	7.1 (8.1)
Mental Retardation	16.7 (10.3)	5.6 (12.5)	50.0 (2.6)	11.1 (4.1)	0.0 (0.0)	0.0 (0.0)
Rehabilitation	0.0 (0.0)	0.0 (0.0)	66.7 (1.2)	0.0 (0.0)	0.0 (0.0)	0.0 (0.0)

TABLE 6

DISTRIBUTION OF TYPES OF SOCIAL SERVICES BY SERVICE REGION

Type of Agency	Far North West	Far North Center	North Lakefront	North Cen- tral	North West	Far west
Educational	8.2 (13.8)	2.0 (12.5)	61.2 (8.7)	2.0 (2.0)	0.0 (0.0)	2.0 (4.0)
Family Services	6.3 (34.5)	0.6 (12.5)	50.0 (23.0)	6.3 (20.4)	0.6 (100.0)	4.4 (28.0)
Family Substitution	10.0 (0.3)	3.3 (12.5)	40.0 (3.5)	6.7 (4.1)	0.0 (0.0)	10.0 (12.0)
Socialization	6.3 (13.8)	3.1 (25.0)	46.9 (8.7)	12.5 (16.3)	0.0 (0.0)	3.1 (8.0)
Community Advocacy	1.1 (6.9)	1.1 (25.0)	58.4 (30.3)	7.9 (28.6)	0.0 (0.0)	5.6 (40.0)
Civic and Cultural	0.0 (0.0)	0.0 (0.0)	75.0 (0.9)	0.0 (0.0)	0.0 (0.0)	0.0 (0.0)
Column Total	29 4.7* (100.0)	8 1.3* (100.0)	343 55.1* (100.0)	49 7.9* (100.0)	1 0.2* (100.0)	25 4.0* (100.0)

* Indicates categorical percentages calculated from the total.

** Parenthesized figures indicate column percentages.

TABLE 6

DISTRIBUTION OF TYPES OF SOCIAL SERVICES BY SERVICE REGION

Type of Agency	Near West	Mid-South Lakefront	Mid-South Central	Mid-South West	South West	South Central East	South East
Consumer	6.3 (7.1)	3.1 (6.7)	0.0 (0.0)	0.0 (0.0)	0.0 (0.0)	0.0 (0.0)	0.0 (0.0)
Employment	10.7 (5.4)	3.6 (3.3)	7.1 (9.1)	3.6 (12.5)	0.0 (0.0)	7.1 (13.3)	7.1 (22.2)
Basic Needs	7.1 (2.0)	0.0 (0.0)	0.0 (0.0)	0.0 (0.0)	0.0 (0.0)	0.0 (0.0)	0.0 (0.0)
Housing	0.0 (0.0)	6.7 (3.3)	0.0 (0.0)	0.0 (0.0)	0.0 (0.0)	0.0 (0.0)	0.0 (0.0)
Mental Health	13.3 (3.6)	0.0 (0.0)	6.7 (4.5)	0.0 (0.0)	0.0 (0.0)	0.0 (0.0)	0.0 (0.0)
Sustenance Abuse	20.0 (5.4)	0.0 (0.0)	6.7 (4.5)	0.0 (0.0)	0.0 (0.0)	0.0 (0.0)	0.0 (0.0)
Physical Health	7.1 (3.6)	3.6 (3.3)	7.1 (9.1)	0.0 (0.0)	0.0 (0.0)	0.0 (0.0)	3.6 (11.1)
Mental Retardation	0.0 (0.0)	0.0 (0.0)	5.6 (4.5)	5.6 (12.5)	0.0 (0.0)	5.6 (6.7)	0.0 (0.0)
Rehabilitation	33.3 (3.6)	0.0 (0.0)	0.0 (0.0)	0.0 (0.0)	0.0 (0.0)	0.0 (0.0)	0.0 (0.0)

TABLE 6

DISTRIBUTION OF TYPES OF SOCIAL SERVICES BY SERVICE REGION

Type of Agency	Near West	Mid-South Lakefront	Mid-South Central	Mid-South West	South West	South Central East	South East
Educational	6.1 (5.4)	8.2 (13.3)	0.0 (0.0)	4.1 (25.0)	0.0 (0.0)	2.0 (6.7)	2.0 (11.1)
Family Services	12.7 (35.7)	5.1 (26.7)	3.2 (22.7)	1.3 (25.0)	1.9 (37.5)	1.9 (20.0)	0.6 (11.1)
Family Substitution	0.0 (0.0)	10.0 (10.0)	6.7 (9.1)	3.3 (12.5)	0.0 (0.0)	0.0 (0.0)	3.3 (11.1)
Socialization	6.3 (7.1)	3.1 (6.7)	1.6 (4.5)	0.0 (0.0)	3.1 (25.0)	4.7 (20.0)	1.6 (11.1)
Community Advocacy	8.4 (26.8)	5.6 (33.3)	3.4 (27.3)	0.6 (12.5)	1.7 (37.5)	2.8 (33.3)	1.1 (22.2)
Civic and Cultural	25.0 (1.8)	0.0 (0.0)	0.0 (0.0)	0.0 (0.0)	0.0 (0.0)	0.0 (0.0)	0.0 (0.0)

TABLE 6

DISTRIBUTION OF TYPES OF SOCIAL SERVICES BY REGION

Type of Agency	Far South East	Far South Central	Far South West	Row Total	N of Cases
Consumer	0.0 (0.0)	0.0 (0.0)	0.0 (0.0)	(0.2)	1
Employment	0.0 (0.0)	0.0 (0.0)	0.0 (0.0)	(4.5)	28
Basic Needs	0.0 (0.0)	0.0 (0.0)	0.0 (0.0)	(2.2)	14
Housing	0.0 (0.0)	0.0 (0.0)	0.0 (0.0)	(2.4)	15
Mental Health	0.0 (0.0)	0.0 (0.0)	0.0 (0.0)	(2.4)	15
Sustenance Abuse	0.0 (0.0)	0.0 (0.0)	0.0 (0.0)	(2.4)	15
Physical Health	0.0 (0.0)	0.0 (0.0)	0.0 (0.0)	(4.5)	28
Mental Retardation	0.0 (0.0)	0.0 (0.0)	0.0 (0.0)	(2.9)	18
Rehabilitation	0.0 (0.0)	0.0 (0.0)	0.0 (0.0)	(1.0)	6

TABLE 6

DISTRIBUTION OF TYPES OF SOCIAL SERVICES BY SERVICE REGION

Type of Agency	Far South East	Far South Central	Far South West	Row Total	N of Cases
Educational	0.0 (0.0)	2.0 (8.3)	0.0 (0.0)	(7.9)	49
Family Services	1.9 (60.0)	2.5 (33.3)	0.6 (33.3)	(25.4)	158
Family Substitution	0.0 (0.0)	6.7 (16.7)	0.0 (0.0)	(4.8)	30
Socialization	0.0 (0.0)	6.3 (33.3)	1.6 (33.3)	(10.3)	64
Community Advocacy	1.1 (40.0)	0.6 (8.3)	0.6 (33.3)	(28.6)	178
Civic and Cultural	0.0 (0.0)	0.0 (0.0)	0.0 (0.0)	(0.6)	4
Column Total	5 0.8* (100.0)	12 1.9* (100.0)	3 0.5* (100.0)	100.0 (100.0)	623

and the Near North Side, which is increasingly coming to be viewed as the new little Loop, or housing the spillover of commerce from the Loop. A tremendous preponderance of social service agencies are headquartered in the Loop, and a somewhat lesser but increasing proportion within the Near North Side. This pattern becomes increasingly clearer when considering that for any particular type of social service, the North Lakefront contains a minimum of forty percent of the city's agencies.

The dispersion of the social service agencies throughout the South Side is consequently quite small when compared with the North Side of the city. As noted earlier (and there are regional exceptions) the South Side as a whole tends to contain more blacks and more poverty than the North Side. Additionally, of those agencies located within the southern regions of Chicago, the agencies tend to be located comparatively farther north than a random distribution might indicate. The exception to the pattern presented here might be the Mid-South Lakefront, which contains Hyde Park, housing the University of Chicago. Although this area does comparatively better than the rest of the South Side, it is deprived of social service agencies relative to the North Lakefront.

The Near West appears to do slightly better than other service regions in terms of percentages of social services within its boundaries. This region is peculiar in that it is underrepresented in terms of the amount of social ser-

vices which it should have, but is actually overrepresented in terms of what it does have in comparison with the other southern and western service regions. Perhaps this overrepresentation might be partially explained in two ways: the Near West is located directly adjacent to the Loop, and may, therefore, contain some spillage from this area. Second, the area houses a large proportion of hospitals and their related services, the University of Illinois' Circle Campus and its attendant social services, plus being the location of many of Hull House's older agencies and programs. The pattern of underrepresentation (in terms of a theoretically equitable distribution) may well be accounted for by the fact that there simply may not be enough social service agencies to be distributed throughout the city once the North Lakefront and other northern regions nip off their disproportionately large percentage chunks of social service agencies.

The most interesting point to be made about the location of all social services is that most agencies tend to group together. Should this prove to be a real trend, this factor will operate to suppress the establishment of any new social services in areas which at the present have none or only few social service agencies. If this is indeed the case, the only hope which may be in sight for the "Black Belt" of Chicago might well be that the Loop and Mid-South Lakefront areas begin to spill over from their boundaries, and move progressively westward. It may be possible to speculate upon the possible development (or perhaps nondevelopment) of

this pattern in light of the real estate redevelopment of the central city, and most notably of the lakefront areas. This author would speculate that should this condominium conversion trend continue at its current pace or accelerate, it will bode ill for the poverty pockets of the city by decreasing their chances at access to private social welfare services. The news media has already been indicating that the poor are being displaced, (nearly always further west). If this trend continues, the Poor will be entering areas with presumably low proportions of social service agencies. Since these agencies exhibit a general tendency to group together, it may well be a while before these 'new poor' areas receive social services from the private sector.

Table 7 indicates that the social services which do have orientations toward given minorities tend to prefer blacks, followed by Jewish, Hispanic, and American Indian preferences. The category all minority contains approximately one quarter of all the agencies with an ethnic or racial orientation. The figures within this table represent maximums, since they are proportions of those agencies which have a minority focus or preference. Those agencies with an orientation toward minorities represent slightly above one quarter of the city's total number of social services within this sample. Because of the relatively small number of cases, the following types of social service agencies will be excluded from this discussion: basic needs, housing, mental health, sustenance abuse, physical health, mental retardation, rehabil-

TABLE 7

ORGANIZATIONAL ORIENTATION: ETHNIC, RACIAL, AND RELIGIOUS IDENTITY
BY TYPE OF SOCIAL SERVICE

Type of Agency	American Indian	Black	Hispanic	Jewish	All Minority	Row Total
Consumer	0.0 (0.0)	0.0 (0.0)	0.0 (0.0)	0.0 (0.0)	0.0 (0.0)	0.0
Employment	12.5 (12.5)	12.5 (2.0)	37.5 (9.7)	25.0 (5.9)	37.5 (7.3)	4.8
Basic Needs	0.0 (0.0)	0.0 (0.0)	50.0 (3.2)	0.0 (0.0)	50.0 (2.4)	1.2
Housing	0.0 (0.0)	25.0 (2.0)	25.0 (3.2)	0.0 (0.0)	50.0 (4.9)	2.4
Mental Health	0.0 (0.0)	0.0 (0.0)	100.0 (6.5)	0.0 (0.0)	0.0 (0.0)	1.2
Sustenance Abuse	0.0 (0.0)	0.0 (0.0)	50.0 (3.2)	0.0 (0.0)	50.0 (2.4)	1.2
Physical Health	50.0 (12.5)	50.0 (2.0)	0.0 (0.0)	0.0 (0.0)	0.0 (0.0)	1.2
Mental Retardation	0.0 (0.0)	0.0 (0.0)	0.0 (0.0)	0.0 (0.0)	100.0 (4.9)	1.2

TABLE 7

ORGANIZATIONAL ORIENTATION: ETHNIC, RACIAL, AND RELIGIOUS IDENTITY

BY TYPE OF SOCIAL SERVICE

Type of Agency	American Indian	Black	Hispanic	Jewish	All Minority	Row Total
Rehabilitation	0.0 (0.0)	0.0 (0.0)	0.0 (0.0)	0.0 (0.0)	0.0 (0.0)	0.0
Educational	0.0 (0.0)	15.4 (3.9)	46.2 (19.4)	15.4 (5.9)	23.1 (7.3)	7.9
Family Services	0.0 (0.0)	56.8 (41.2)	13.5 (16.1)	18.9 (20.6)	10.8 (9.8)	22.4
Family Substitution	0.0 (0.0)	25.0 (2.0)	0.0 (0.0)	50.0 (5.9)	25.0 (2.4)	2.4
Socialization	5.9 (12.5)	17.6 (5.9)	11.8 (6.5)	58.8 (29.4)	5.9 (2.4)	10.3
Community Advocacy	8.1 (62.5)	33.9 (41.2)	16.1 (32.3)	4.8 (8.8)	37.1 (56.1)	37.6
Civic and Cultural	0.0 (0.0)	0.0 (0.0)	0.0 (0.0)	0.0 (0.0)	0.0 (0.0)	0.0
Column Total	8 4.8* (100.0)	51 30.9* (100.0)	31 18.8* (100.0)	34 20.6* (100.0)	39 23.6* (100.0)	165 100.0* (100.0)

TABLE 7

ORGANIZATIONAL ORIENTATION: ETHNIC, RACIAL, AND RELIGIOUS IDENTITY

BY TYPE OF SOCIAL SERVICE

- * Indicates categorical percentages calculated from total.
- ** Parenthesized figures denote column percentages.
- *** Two Asian American oriented agencies are included within the All Minority Total.
- **** Because some organizations within this sample do not serve minority groups, the data presented here is a subsample of the entire sample, and it is not expected that the rows necessarily add up to 100.0 percent.

itation, and civic and cultural.

The largest proportion of services dedicated to the American Indian appears to be within the area of community advocacy, as is the case for blacks and Hispanics, although blacks and Hispanic oriented agencies also appear to emphasize family services. A small but substantial proportion of Hispanic oriented services appear to be of the educational type. The largest proportion of Jewish oriented services are socialization and family services. The major concern of services oriented toward all minorities is that of community advocacy.

Of the educational services with a predisposition toward minorities, the preferred minority group would appear to be Hispanics, as is also the case for employment services. Among family services, the preferred minority group is blacks, followed by the Jewish. Among family substitution services, the preferred minority group is that of the Jewish, as is the case for socialization service agencies. Community advocacy services with orientations seem to concentrate their orientations in all minorities and blacks.

Table 8 indicates the organizational focus and the relation with the ethnic, racial, and religious distributions of the service regions. The percentages indicate a certain degree of matching for the American Indians, in that agencies with this focus are located within the North Lakefront, which has the highest population concentration of American Indians. For the most part, those areas with large concentrations of Hispanics tend to be well represented in terms of having rela-

TABLE 8

ORGANIZATIONAL FOCUS AND COMMUNITY CHARACTERISTICS;
ETHNIC, RACIAL, AND RELIGIOUS IDENTITY BY REGION

Region	<u>American Indians</u>		<u>Blacks</u>		<u>Hispanics</u>	
	% Agencies	% People	% Agencies	% People	% Agencies	% People
Far North West	0.0 (0.0)	0.0	0.0 (0.0)	0.02	0.0 (0.0)	1.1
Far North Center	0.0 (0.0)	0.2	0.0 (0.0)	0.1	0.0 (0.0)	4.5
North Lakefront	11.8 (100.0)	0.6	22.1 (29.4)	8.0	13.2 (29.0)	10.0
North Central	0.0 (0.0)	0.3	27.8 (9.8)	6.2	50.0 (29.0)	24.1
North West	0.0 (0.0)	0.0	0.0 (0.0)	0.2	0.0 (0.0)	1.4
Far West	0.0 (0.0)	0.1	0.0 (0.0)	71.4	0.0 (0.0)	2.2
Near West	0.0 (0.0)	0.2	53.3 (15.7)	74.4	13.3 (6.5)	5.7
Mid-South Lakefront	0.0 (0.0)	0.1	25.0 (6.7)	87.8	0.0 (0.0)	1.0

TABLE 8

ORGANIZATIONAL FOCUS AND COMMUNITY CHARACTERISTICS:
ETHNIC, RACIAL, AND RELIGIOUS IDENTITY BY REGION

Region	<u>Jewish</u> % Agencies	% People	<u>All Minorities</u> % Agencies	<u>Row Total</u>
Far North West	100.0 (23.5)	8.3	0.0 (0.0)	4.8
Far North Center	0.0 (0.0)	3.5	100.0 (2.4)	0.6
North Lakefront	30.9 (61.8)	4.0	22.0 (36.6)	41.2
North Central	5.6 (2.9)	0.2	16.7 (7.3)	10.9
North West	0.0 (0.0)	0.1	0.0 (0.0)	0.0
Far West	6.7 (2.9)	0.1	6.7 (2.4)	9.1
Near West	6.7 (2.9)	0.2	26.7 (9.8)	9.1
Mid-South Lakefront	25.0 (5.9)	0.6	50.0 (9.8)	4.8

TABLE 8

ORGANIZATIONAL FOCUS AND COMMUNITY CHARACTERISTICS:
ETHNIC, RACIAL, AND RELIGIOUS IDENTITY BY REGION

Region	<u>American Indians</u>		<u>Blacks</u>		<u>Hispanics</u>	
	% Agencies	% People	% Agencies	% People	% Agencies	% People
Mid-South Central	0.0 (0.0)	0.2	20.0 (25.0)	2.1	80.0 (25.0)	24.1
Mid-South West	0.0 (0.0)	0.2	0.0 (0.0)	5.6	75.0 (9.7)	13.7
South West	0.0 (0.0)	0.0	0.0 (0.0)	0.0	0.0 (0.0)	1.2
South Central East	0.0 (0.0)	0.0	13.3 (3.9)	78.6	0.0 (0.0)	1.9
South East	0.0 (0.0)	0.1	0.0 (0.0)	59.2	0.0 (0.0)	11.2
Far South East	0.0 (0.0)	0.1	50.0 (2.0)	31.9	0.0 (0.0)	5.2
Far South Central	0.0 (0.0)	0.1	50.0 (5.9)	62.3	0.0 (0.0)	1.4
Far South West	0.0 (0.0)	0.0	0.0 (0.0)	0.5	0.0 (0.0)	0.8

TABLE 8

ORGANIZATIONAL FOCUS AND COMMUNITY CHARACTERISTICS:
ETHNIC, RACIAL, AND RELIGIOUS IDENTITY BY REGION

Region	<u>Jewish</u> % Agencies	% People	<u>All Minorities</u> % Agencies	<u>Row Total</u>
Mid-South Central	0.0 (0.0)	0.0	0.0 (0.0)	6.1
Mid-South West	0.0 (0.0)	0.1	25.4 (2.4)	2.4
South West	0.0 (0.0)	0.4	100.0 (2.4)	0.6
South Central East	0.0 (0.0)	0.5	50.0 (4.9)	2.4
South East	0.0 (0.0)	0.2	100.0 (12.2)	3.0
Far South East	0.0 (0.0)	0.5	50.0 (2.4)	1.2
Far South Central	0.0 (0.0)	0.4	50.0 (7.3)	3.6
Far South West	0.0 (0.0)	0.8	0.0 (0.0)	0.0

TABLE 8

ORGANIZATIONAL FOCUS AND COMMUNITY CHARACTERISTICS:
ETHNIC, RACIAL, AND RELIGIOUS IDENTITY BY REGION

Region	<u>American Indians</u> % Agencies	<u>Blacks</u> % Agencies	<u>Hispanics</u> % Agencies
Column Total	8 .8* (100.0)	51 30.9* (100.0)	31 18.8* (100.0)

* Indicates categorical percentages calculated from total.

** Parenthesized figures denote column percentages.

*** Two Asian American oriented agencies were added into the All Minority category.

**** Because some agencies within Chicago do not serve any particular minority group, the data indicated here form a subsample of the sample. Therefore, it is not expected that the row totals necessarily add up to 100.0 percent.

TABLE 8

ORGANIZATIONAL FOCUS AND COMMUNITY CHARACTERISTICS:
 ETHNIC, RACIAL, AND RELIGIOUS IDENTITY BY REGION

Region	<u>Jewish</u> % Agencies % People	<u>All Minorities</u> % Agencies	<u>Row Total</u>
Column Total	34 20.6* (100.0)	41 24.8* (100.0)	165 100.0* (100.0)

tively large concentrations of Hispanics within their populations tend to be well represented in terms of having relatively large proportions of agencies with Hispanic orientations within their boundaries. Such examples are the North Lakefront, North Central, Near West, Mid-South Central, and Mid-South West. The greatest amount of mismatch would appear to be among the areas with large percentages of black populations, and the percentages of black oriented services within their borders. On the North Side, black oriented agencies are relatively overrepresented, however, there are few blacks on the North Side. Correspondingly, black oriented agencies are severely underrepresented in areas where blacks are a substantial proportion of the population: Far West, Near West, Mid-South Lakefront, Mid-South Central, South Central East, South East, and Far South Central.

The traditional popular conception would seem to indicate that the oldest and most recognized minority group is the Negro. Perhaps this may help to explain the tremendous mismatch. Possibly some proportion of the agencies which serve blacks have been in operation for some time. These types of agencies may have been established during a time when popular phraseology might well have expressed a global concern for all minorities in their charters, and therefore may be characterized as having an all minority focus, while serving a primarily black clientele, and being located in predominantly black neighborhoods. Support for this argument comes from the fact that the following areas which have

large proportions of blacks within their boundaries, also tend to have fairly large and substantial proportions of agencies with an all minority orientation: Far West, Mid-South Lakefront, South Central East, Far South Central, and South East. Perhaps this argument may help to soften the apparent severity of disproportions of social services with respect to the black population.

It is particularly interesting to note the interplay between minority groups. For the most part, Hispanics appear to be the preferential minority group within the northern regions of the city. However, as one examines the regions further south, especially the farthest southern regions, the Hispanics lose proportionately more ground, while blacks tend to gain proportionately more ground, in terms of having welfare services with orientations toward these particular minority groups. To a certain extent, this tends to mirror the ethnic distributions of the entire city. The truest match between the populations and social service agencies indicated by this data is in terms of the agencies with Jewish orientations. These agencies tend to concentrate in the North Lakefront and the Far North West, which has the largest proportions of the Jewish population in the city.

Table 9 is intended to give an indication of the match between the age orientation of those agencies which indicate age preferences and their target populations. On the whole, the elderly do not appear to be doing as well as youths. However, it must be kept in mind that although their numbers and

TABLE 9

AGENCY ORIENTATION: AGENCY PERCENTAGES

AGE BY TYPE OF SOCIAL SERVICE

Type of Agency	Elderly	Youths	Row Total
Consumer	0.0 (0.0)	0.0 (0.0)	0.0
Employment	0.0 (0.0)	100.0 (0.7)	0.5
Basic Needs	50.0 (3.6)	50.0 (1.4)	2.0
Housing	100.0 (9.1)	0.0 (0.0)	0.5
Mental Health	0.0 (0.0)	100.0 (0.7)	0.5
Sustenance Abuse	0.0 (0.0)	100.0 (0.7)	0.5
Physical Health	83.3 (9.1)	16.7 (0.7)	3.0
Mental Retardation	0.0 (0.0)	100.0 (6.2)	4.5
Rehabilitation	0.0 (0.0)	100.0 (0.7)	0.5
Educational	3.0 (4.5)	97.0 (22.1)	16.5
Family	24.1 (38.2)	75.9 (45.5)	43.5
Substitute Family	10.0 (1.8)	90.0 (6.2)	5.0
Socialization	44.5 (14.5)	55.5 (6.9)	9.0

TABLE 9

AGENCY ORIENTATION: AGENCY PERCENTAGE:
AGE BY TYPE OF SOCIAL SERVICE

Type of Agency	Elderly	Youths	Row Total
Community Advocacy	54.5 (21.8)	45.5 (6.9)	11.0
Civic and Cultural	0.0 (0.0)	100.0 (1.4)	1.0
Column Total	55 27.5* (100.0)	145 72.5* (100.0)	200 100.0* (100.0)

* Indicates categorical percentages calculated from total.

** Parenthesized figures indicate column percentages.

proportions are increasing, currently senior citizens are not as plentiful as are youths, and perhaps therefore, not as much of an advocacy concern to private social services. The elderly appear to be overrepresented in terms of housing concerns and physical health services. This combination is probably reflective of retirement centers, housing services designed for independent living, and nursing homes. Youths appear to control the market on sustenance abuse, mental retardation, rehabilitation, educational, family, family substitution, and civic and cultural services. Fairly even splits exist with regard to community advocacy and socialization.

The heaviest concentration of services to seniors appears to be within family oriented services, followed by community advocacy. The heaviest concentration of youth oriented services are family services followed by educational.

Table 10 is intended to give an indication of the match between the age orientations of the social services and the age distribution of the service region in which the agencies are located. In reviewing the overall picture, it would seem that the elderly tend to display the greatest amount of match between the social services oriented toward the aged, and the areas in which the elderly are concentrated. The best indication of this match is within the North Lakefront. Throughout the North Side, the elderly appear to be overrepresented. In the southern regions of the city, the elderly do not appear to be represented by social services

TABLE 10

AGENCY ORIENTATION: AGE BY REGIONAL SERVICE AREA PERCENTAGES

Service Region	<u>Elderly</u>		<u>Youths</u>		<u>Row Total</u>
	% Agencies	% People	% Agencies	% People	
Far North West	23.1 (5.5)	16.8	76.9 (6.9)	29.1	6.5
Far North Center	25.0 (1.8)	14.6	75.0 (2.1)	30.4	2.0
North Lakefront	26.9 (52.7)	14.7	73.1 (54.5)	26.5	54.0
North Central	46.2 (10.1)	9.3	53.8 (4.8)	44.5	6.5
North West	0.0 (0.0)	14.1	100.0 (0.7)	29.6	.5
Far West	42.9 (5.5)	14.4	57.1 (2.8)	44.3	3.5
Near West	14.3 (3.6)	7.6	85.7 (8.3)	47.5	7.0
Mid-South Lakefront	35.7 (9.1)	10.2	64.3 (6.2)	52.8	7.0
Mid-South Central	25.0 (3.6)	8.5	75.0 (4.1)	39.6	4.0

TABLE 10

AGENCY ORIENTATION: AGE BY REGIONAL SERVICE AREA PERCENTAGES

Service Region	<u>Elderly</u>		<u>Youths</u>		<u>Row Total</u>
	% Agencies	% People	% Agencies	% People	
Mid-South West	0.0 (0.0)	8.1	100.0 (2.1)	37.4	1.5
South West	66.7 (3.6)	14.6	33.3 (0.7)	28.8	1.5
South Central East	4.0 (3.6)	8.3	6.0 (2.1)	42.4	2.5
South East	0.0 (0.0)	8.0	100.0 (0.7)	36.2	0.5
Far South East	0.0 (0.0)	7.6	100.0 (0.7)	41.7	0.5
Far South Central	0.0 (0.0)	9.3	100.0 (3.4)	40.4	2.5
Far South West	0.0 (0.0)	10.0	0.0 (0.0)	40.8	0.0
Column Total	55 27.5* (100.0)		145 72.5* (100.0)		200 100.0* (100.0)

* Indicates categorical percentages calculated from the total.

** Parenthesized figures are column totals.

with an orientation toward the elderly.

The greatest amount of mismatch is to be found among the agencies with an orientation to youth and the regions in which they are located. As in the case of senior citizens, youth oriented agencies are overly represented on the North Side, and underrepresented on the South Side, reflecting the general pattern of the social services as a whole. In reviewing the distribution of the agencies with a youth orientation, two of the most glaring contradictions lie within the North Lakefront area and the Far South West. While the former area contains the smallest proportion of youths within the city, it contains well over one half of the city's agencies dedicated to youth services. In fact, nearly three quarters of the age oriented services are youth oriented within the North Lakefront, although only one quarter of the population is young. The extreme case of the South Side represents a more dismal picture. Over forty percent of the population within the service region Far South West is young, but there are no youth oriented services to be found within this area. This appears to be the case for the pattern of distribution of youth oriented services within the city: there are areas with large proportions of children with relatively few youth specific organizations to provide social services for them. The case of the Far South West points up the gross inequities in the distribution of the social services, since youths plus senior citizens within this particular area compose over one half the population. This fact may be explained by the fact

that this particular area contains only three social service agencies within its boundaries. This case again exemplifies the underrepresentation of the private social service agencies on the South Side. Because there are so few private social service agencies on the South Side of Chicago, it would seem unlikely that they would be able to serve the specific needs of the inhabitants of the regions.

Table 11 indicates the religious orientations of the private social service agencies in relation to types of the services provided. The overall picture demonstrates that slightly under one half of the agencies within this sample have religious affiliations. Nearly sixty-two percent of the religious specific social services are Protestant. This is believable since there are many denominations covered by the term Protestant. Despite Chicago's reputation as having a large Catholic population, the percentage of Catholic affiliated social service organizations is surprisingly close to that of the Jewish affiliated social service agencies.

The greatest amount of Protestant concern seems to lie in the areas of family, socialization, and community advocacy. The greatest areas of concern for Catholics tend to be services to the family and community advocacy. The data indicate that the greatest amount of Jewish concern is concentrated in family and socialization services.

Civic and cultural as well as consumer agencies are not affiliated with any particular religion. This author would speculate that this is due to a combination of factors:

TABLE 11

AGENCY ORIENTATION: RELIGIOUS AFFILIATION
BY TYPE OF SOCIAL SERVICE PERCENTAGES

Type of Agency	Catholic	Protestant	Jewish	Row Total
Consumer	0.0 (0.0)	0.0 (0.0)	0.0 (0.0)	0.0 (0.0)
Employment	15.4 (3.6)	61.5 (4.7)	23.1 (6.1)	4.7
Basic Needs	10.0 (1.8)	70.0 (4.1)	20.0 (4.1)	3.6
Housing	0.0 (0.0)	20.0 (0.6)	80.0 (8.2)	1.8
Mental Health	20.0 (1.8)	80.0 (2.4)	0.0 (0.0)	1.8
Sustenance Abuse	37.5 (5.4)	62.5 (3.0)	0.0 (0.0)	2.9
Physical Health	33.3 (5.4)	33.3 (1.8)	33.3 (6.1)	3.3
Mental Retardation	57.1 (7.1)	28.6 (1.2)	14.3 (2.0)	2.1
Rehabilitation	100.0 (3.6)	0.0 (0.0)	0.0 (0.0)	0.7
Educational	25.0 (8.9)	60.0 (7.1)	15.0 (6.1)	7.3
Family	15.5 (19.6)	64.8 (27.2)	19.7 (28.6)	25.9
Family Substitution	20.0 (8.9)	72.0 (10.7)	8.0 (4.1)	9.1
Socialization	7.8 (7.1)	70.6 (21.3)	21.6 (22.4)	18.6

TABLE 11

AGENCY ORIENTATION: RELIGIOUS AFFILIATION
BY TYPE OF SOCIAL SERVICE PERCENTAGES

Type of Service	Catholic	Protestant	Jewish	Row Total
Community Advocacy	31.3 (26.8)	56.3 (16.0)	12.5 (12.2)	17.5
Civic and Cultural	0.0 (0.0)	0.0 (0.0)	0.0 (0.0)	0.0
Column Total	56 20.4* (100.0)	169 61.7* (100.0)	49 17.9* (100.0)	274 100.0* (100.0)

* Indicates categorical percentages calculated from total.

** Parenthesized figures denote column percentages.

*** Due to the fact that some social services within this sample are not religiously affiliated, the row percentages are not expected to necessarily add up to 100.0 percent.

there are actually very few of these organizations, and additionally, these services may well represent more secularized interests. Protestant affiliated agencies tend to account for the largest proportions of the religious affiliations: employment, mental health, sustenance abuse, education, family, substitute family, socialization, and community advocacy. Catholic affiliated agencies tend to account for large proportions of services for mental retardation and rehabilitation. Jewish affiliated social services tend to account for a large proportion of housing services. It is interesting to note the three way split between the three denominations falling into the category of physical health. It is suspected that what is occurring here are reflections of different ways of handling the problems of the elderly. A great many of the Jewish affiliated homes for the elderly appear to be retirement centers. A goodly proportion of the Catholic affiliated homes for the elderly appear to be nursing homes, actual medical facilities. This may well indicate a fundamental difference in the way in which religious concern is concretized into actual social services.

The data of Table 12 is intended to provide indications of the distribution of religious affiliated social services by area. The pattern for different services, tend, to a large part, to repeat the pattern indicated by the totals. Most of the agencies tend to have large concentrations of Protestant social services contained in them, which is the general overall picture of the entire city's distribution of

TABLE 12

AGENCY ORIENTATION: RELIGIOUS AFFILIATION
PERCENTAGES BY SERVICE REGION

Service Region	Catholic	Protestant	Jewish	Row Total
Far North West	9.5 (3.6)	52.4 (6.5)	38.1 (16.3)	7.7
Far North Center	0.0 (0.0)	57.1 (2.4)	42.9 (6.1)	2.6
North Lakefront	27.8 (67.9)	49.6 (40.2)	22.6 (63.3)	50.0
North Center	7.7 93.6)	88.5 (13.6)	3.8 (2.0)	9.5
North West	0.0 (0.0)	0.0 (0.0)	0.0 (0.0)	0.0
Far West	0.0 (0.0)	87.5 (4.1)	12.5 (2.0)	2.9
Near West	27.3 (16.1)	69.7 (13.6)	3.0 (2.0)	12.0
Mid-South Lakefront	0.0 (0.0)	71.4 (5.9)	28.6 (8.2)	5.1
Mid-South Central	50.0 (7.1)	50.0 (2.4)	0.0 (0.0)	2.9
Mid-South West	100.0 (1.8)	0.0 (0.0)	0.0 (0.0)	0.4
South Central East	0.0 (0.0)	100.0 (3.0)	0.0 (0.0)	1.8
South East	0.0 (0.0)	100.0 (1.2)	0.0 (0.0)	0.7
Far South East	0.0 (0.0)	100.0 (0.6)	0.0 (0.0)	0.4

TABLE 12

AGENCY ORIENTATION: RELIGIOUS AFFILIATION
 PERCENTAGES BY SERVICE REGION

Service Region	Catholic	Protestant	Jewish	Row Total
Far South Central	0.0 (0.0)	100.0 (3.0)	0.0 (0.0)	1.8
Far South West	0.0 (0.0)	100.0 (1.2)	0.0 (0.0)	0.7
Column Total	56 20.4* (100.0)	169 61.7* (100.0)	49 17.9* (100.0)	274 100.0* (100.0)

* Indicates categorical percentages calculated from total.

** Parenthesized figures are column percentages.

*** Because the data represented in this table is a subsample of the entire sample, in that not all agencies are included within this table (there are agencies without religious affiliations), it is not expected that the rows will necessarily add up to 100.0 percent.

private social services. The Catholics tend to concentrate themselves most heavily in the North Lakefront, and to a somewhat lesser extent, throughout the North Side. With two exceptions of Mid-South Central and Mid-South West, Catholic social service agencies display a marked pattern of excluding the South Side. This same pattern is true of the Jewish affiliated organizations, a heavy concentration within the northern areas, and a marked avoidance of the South Side, with the exception of the Mid-South Lakefront region, in which nearly one fourth of the agencies which do specify religious affiliation are Jewish affiliated, probably because there are many Jewish people living in Hyde Park.

Although the Protestant social services display the heaviest concentration of their affiliated social services within the Northern regions, it is clear that they are the predominant affiliation for private South Side social service agencies. This is most certainly related to the fact that the South Side contains large proportions of blacks, who traditionally have been more likely to be Protestant than either Catholic or Jewish.

Perhaps more important than race, age, or religious concerns are the problem focuses of the areas' agencies. This may well serve to indicate what are the regional needs of a particular area. However, this indicate could only hold if the assumption is made that the pluralistic principle of issues finding representation as they come to light is operating here. Table 13 indicates what the private social services

TABLE 13

AGENCY FOCUS: PROBLEM AREA PERCENTAGES BY SERVICE REGION

Service Region	Mental Retard- ation	Handi- capped	Drug Abuse	Alco- holism	Ex-offen- der	Poverty	Physi- cal Health	Mental Health	Row Total
Far North West	20.0 (8.8)	13.3 (6.7)	0.0 (0.0)	13.3 (12.5)	0.0 (0.0)	33.3 (1.9)	6.7 (5.0)	13.3 (7.1)	3.8
Far North Center	25.0 (2.9)	0.0 (0.0)	0.0 (0.0)	0.0 (0.0)	0.0 (0.0)	75.0 (1.1)	0.0 (0.0)	0.0 (0.0)	1.0
North Lakefront	6.5 (38.2)	3.5 (58.3)	2.0 (50.0)	4.5 (56.3)	3.0 (54.5)	65.0 (48.1)	6.0 (60.0)	9.5 (67.9)	50.1
North Center	4.9 (5.9)	0.0 (0.0)	2.4 (12.5)	4.9 (12.5)	2.4 (9.1)	73.2 (11.1)	7.3 (15.0)	4.9 (7.1)	10.3
North West	0.0 (0.0)	0.0 (0.0)	100.0 (12.5)	0.0 (0.0)	0.0 (0.0)	0.0 (0.0)	0.0 (0.0)	0.0 (0.0)	0.3
Near West	0.0 (0.0)	0.0 (0.0)	0.0 (0.0)	0.0 (0.0)	0.0 (0.0)	94.4 (6.3)	5.6 (5.0)	0.0 (0.0)	4.5
Far West	4.3 (5.9)	6.5 (25.0)	0.0 (0.0)	6.5 (18.8)	8.7 (36.4)	65.2 (11.1)	4.3 (10.0)	4.3 (7.1)	11.5
Mid-South Lakefront	6.3 (2.9)	0.0 (0.0)	0.0 (0.0)	0.0 (0.0)	0.0 (0.0)	93.8 (5.6)	0.0 (0.0)	0.0 (0.0)	4.0
Mid-South Central	5.3 (2.9)	0.0 (0.0)	5.3 (12.5)	0.0 (0.0)	0.0 (0.0)	78.9 (5.6)	5.3 (5.0)	5.3 (3.6)	4.8

TABLE 13

AGENCY FOCUS: PROBLEM AREA PERCENTAGES BY SERVICE REGION

Service Region	Mental Retard-	Handi- capped	Drug Abuse	Alco- holism	Ex-offen- der	Poverty cal	Physical Health	Mental Health	Row Total
Mid-South West	16.7 (2.9)	0.0 (0.0)	0.0 (0.0)	0.0 (0.0)	0.0 (0.0)	83.3 (1.9)	0.0 (0.0)	0.0 (0.0)	1.5
South West	0.0 (0.0)	0.0 (0.0)	0.0 (0.0)	0.0 (0.0)	0.0 (0.0)	100.0 (1.5)	0.0 (0.0)	0.0 (0.0)	1.0
South Central East	10.0 (2.9)	0.0 (0.0)	10.0 (12.5)	0.0 (0.0)	0.0 (0.0)	70.0 (2.6)	0.0 (0.0)	10.0 (0.0)	2.5
South East	71.4 (14.7)	0.0 (0.0)	0.0 (0.0)	0.0 (0.0)	0.0 (0.0)	14.3 (0.4)	0.0 (0.0)	14.3 (3.6)	1.8
Far South East	25.0 (2.9)	0.0 (0.0)	0.0 (0.0)	0.0 (0.0)	0.0 (0.0)	75.0 (1.1)	0.0 (0.0)	0.0 (0.0)	1.0
Far South Central	37.5 (8.8)	0.0 (0.0)	0.0 (0.0)	0.0 (0.0)	0.0 (0.0)	62.5 (1.9)	0.0 (0.0)	0.0 (0.0)	2.0
Far South West	0.0 (0.0)	0.0 (0.0)	0.0 (0.0)	0.0 (0.0)	0.0 (0.0)	0.0 (0.0)	0.0 (0.0)	0.0 (0.0)	0.0
Column Total	34 8.5 (100.0)	12 3.0 (100.0)	8 2.0 (100.0)	16 4.0 (100.0)	11 2.8 (100.0)	270 67.7 (100.0)	20 5.0 (100.0)	28 7.0 (100.0)	622 100.0 (100.0)

* Indicates categorical percentages calculated from total.

** Parenthesized figures are column percentages.

perceive as the issues and needs of a particular region.

Agencies focusing on certain problems tend to be concentrated in certain areas, although the overall proportions of agencies with particular focuses imposes limits on this observation, agencies with poverty or disadvantaged themes appear to predominate throughout. All agency identified focuses: sustenance abuse services, ex-offender rehabilitation, poverty, physical health, and mental health, are centered within the North Lakefront region. Although this is the most populated area, it is unlikely that this region is troubled by these concerns in greater proportions than other areas. The apparent pattern is the continuing concentration of agencies in the North Lakefront, where specialized services for such problems and issues are available, while other areas produce the problems. Put in simplistic terms, the North Lakefront has the solutions, while the other areas have the problems.

As indicated, areas tend to have a predominance of poverty oriented agencies. The northern areas also exhibit concern with mental retardation and mental health, with a lesser degree of concern exhibited for physical health. The western section of the city appear to display an overriding concern with poverty and little else, with the exception of the Near West which seems to display at least a minimal concern for all issues. This may again be a reflection of its proximity to the Loop, and the spillover effect. For the most part, the South Side as a whole cannot seem to break

away from the pervasive concern with poverty. This is more than logical since it contains some of the largest poverty pockets in the city. Some areas do indicate concern with the issues of mental health and mental retardation. Both these particular issues are linked to poverty issues since there is a linkage between mental health and environmental surroundings, and mental retardation and nutrition.

Table 14 indicates the amount of dissimilarity between the distribution of the total population and the various types of social service agencies. In considering the entire city, no differences seems to exist with respect to the distribution of agencies and the population as a whole. The two indices of dissimilarity are, in fact, nearly identical. In either case, roughly forty-six percent of the population or social services would have to move to equalize the distribution of the social services and the population. This index indicates a great deal of maldistribution, and a more generalized bias against the poverty population. Considering the population as a whole, the most skewed distribution of agencies occurs in the fields of civic and cultural affairs, consumer agencies, basic needs, and rehabilitation. It is wise to remember that the first two types of social services combined represent a total of five out of Chicago's private social services, and therefore, it is quite risky to draw any conclusions about these two categories.

For the population as a whole, those agencies that are best distributed are employment, family substitution,

TABLE 14

SOCIAL SERVICES, THE POPULATION AS A WHOLE, AND THE
POVERTY POPULATION - AN INDEX OF DISSIMILARITY SUMMARY

Type of Service	Total Population	Poverty Population
Consumer	86.45	88.95
Employment	37.1	50.55
Basic Needs	74.6	74.4
Housing	64.9	71.1
Mental Health	61.25	62.0
Sustenance Abuse	67.95	63.45
Physical Health	47.9	50.3
Mentally Retarded	50.15	63.55
Rehabilitation	82.05	79.05
Education	50.35	56.25
Family	44.8	46.2
Family Substitution	33.5	52.4
Socialization	37.07	46.61
Community Advocacy	48.85	47.01
Civic and Cultural	82.05	71.05
Chicago City Total	46.1	46.2

and socialization services. Nonetheless, roughly thirty to forty percent of the total population or social service agencies would have to relocate in order to bring about a more equitable distribution. For the population as a whole, the pattern is one of gross maldistribution, for all types of social services.

For four comparisons between the poverty population and particular social service agencies there is less of a maldistribution when considering all agencies: basic needs, sustenance abuse, substitute family, and community advocacy. In all cases, the difference is less than ten points, and usually much less, therefore, not really important. For ten types of agencies, the poverty population is doing comparatively worse than the population as a whole in relation to the distribution of social services. Compared to the distribution of the poverty population the three most maldistributed types of social services are consumer, basic needs, and rehabilitation. These agencies are the most maldistributed for both populations. The best distributed social services compared to the poverty population appear to be socialization, family, and community advocacy. However, even at best, nearly fifty percent of the poverty population of fifty percent of the services should move to equalize things.

Given the geographic dispersion of the city's private social services, with over one half the concentration in the North Lakefront, it is expected that a considerable

degree of mismatch between the potential target populations and the location of agencies would exist. The underrepresentation of social service agencies on the South Side is striking in light of the extensive poverty and large black population. Furthermore, since agencies tend to be located near each other, the pattern is unlikely to change.

Agencies with black orientations tend to display the worst degree of match regarding their locations. The Jewish and American Indian oriented agencies tend to show the best degrees of match between their locations and the proportions of the population which are accounted for by those minorities. Particularly in the North, the distribution of the Hispanic population and the location of the Hispanic oriented agencies shows a fair degree of match. The data appear to indicate that blacks are the least represented of all minorities in terms of social services, and considering the geographic dispersion of the black population (located primarily in the South and West Sides) might tend to remain that way. Although areas with substantial proportions of poverty tend to contain the largest proportions of poverty focused agencies, most of the poverty focused agencies are not located in the poorest areas. The poverty population, when compared to the population as a whole, appears to indicate the greatest degree of overall mismatch. Considering the trend of increased proportions of the elderly, it is encouraging that the agencies with senior citizen focuses demonstrate the best degree of match in their locations.

The major point here is that the city's private social service agencies display a great deal of geographic maldistribution. Private social service's avoidance of large areas, such as the South Side, may indicate a selection process for target populations in operation which largely excludes the black population.

The Relations of Financial Support

Perhaps the most critical factors concerning the activities of social service agencies are those which concern financial support or funding. Information about funding may well indicate as much about the actual concerns of social services as do their formal charters.

The purpose of Table 15 is to demonstrate the degree of reliance upon the various sources of funding which the private social service agencies within this sample exhibit. A very hefty proportion of the agencies' income is outside generated, nearly seventy percent. A goodly proportion of the social service agencies within this particular data set tend to rely upon the private sphere. The picture being painted thus far is one of the social services being in vulnerable positions due to their heavy reliance upon outside funding, particularly from private funds. In addition, small but significant portions of funding come to the social service agencies through other agencies and organizations.

Additionally, two very important sources of funding for the private social services within this data set turn out to be the government (at all levels) and funding agencies,

TABLE 15

FUNDING SOURCES

Sources	Mean	Maximum	N of Cases
Outside Generated	69.19	100.0	28
Private	44.78	92.42	41
Unspecified Private	16.70	100.0	86
Individual Contributions	5.78	59.35	40
Corporate Donations	5.36	61.33	36
Legacies and Bequests	2.22	44.83	88
Larger Organizations	7.06	93.78	71
Other Organization	5.19	93.78	74
Umbrella Organizations	1.79	67.84	85
Funding Agency	18.1	74.31	52
Foundations	9.19	71.59	56
Trusts and Funds	8.95	71.82	83
Total Government	18.36	94.31	115
Federal and State	22.08	86.56	77
Local Government	2.24	43.36	59
Agency Generated Income	26.54	98.19	158
Return	3.24	55.93	225
Interest	0.93	55.93	90
Investment	2.58	46.96	92
Earned	22.63	93.13	159
Sales and Rental	4.63	93.19	88

TABLE 15

FUNDING SOURCES

Sources	Mean	Maximum	N of Cases
Membership Dues	3.12	84.56	88
Fees for Services	8.87	93.13	84
Fund Raising Events	0.01	0.09	54
Other	2.51	47.84	88
In-Kind Contributions	0.84	21.21	88

* For all cases, the minimum is equal to 0.0 percent.

** It is not expected that these figures add up to 100.0 percent, since they represent proportions rather than raw data, and there are different numbers of cases for the various sources of income.

*** All data was obtained from the Donor's Forum Organizational Files in Chicago, with the exceptions of those agencies which came under the headings of branches or federations, with only the headquarters listed. In such cases, public listings (Social Services Directory and the Chicago Telephone Directory) were utilized to fill in the gap.

agencies would serve their own interests by employing individuals with grantsmanship expertise.

Agencies are able to generate roughly one quarter of their annual income. It is particularly surprising when considering that fund raising events do not contribute a great deal to the annual incomes of social service agencies. Therefore fund raising endeavors do very little to lessen the dependency of private social service agencies upon outside sources of income.

In most cases there are fairly substantial amounts of money in each of these sources with the exception of fund raising. Additionally, there are relatively few agencies with income from given sources, with the exceptions of agency generated, return, and earned. This would indicate that any conclusions reached here must be viewed critically, since they form a relatively small subset of this particular data set.

The purpose of Table 16 is to demonstrate relationships existing between the sources of funding. As Table 15 indicated, there is a positive and substantial relationship between the size of the annual income for social service agencies and their reliance upon private sources of funding. In light of this fact it is surprising that a mild but negative relationship exists between the size of the annual income and the agencies' reliance upon income from a larger organization such as umbrella organizations or churches. This may be partially explained by the fact that the mean income from larger organizations is quite small. However, it may also be that larger organizations,

TABLE 16

CORRELATION COEFFICIENTS OF OVERALL INCOME AND FUNDING PROPORTIONS

	Income	Outside Generated	Government	Private	Funding Agency	Larger Organi- zation	Agency Generated	Earned
Income	1.0 ^{****} (16)	-0.5 (16)	.15 (54)	.54 (19)	-.13 (52)	-.24 [*] (71)	.20 [*] (70)	.13 (71)
Outside Gener- ated	-.05 (16)	1.00 ^{****} (16)	.52 [*] (16)	.60 ^{***} (16)	.42 [*] (16)	.39 (16)	-.95 ^{***} (16)	-.95 ^{***} (15)
Govern- ment	.15 (54)	.52 [*] (16)	1.00 ^{****} (54)	-.37 (16)	-.28 ^{**} (47)	-.01 (45)	-.47 ^{****} (30)	-.39 (41)
Private	-.18 (19)	.60 (16)	-.37 (16)	1.00 ^{****} (19)	.68 ^{***} (19)	.17 (19)	-.43 [*] (18)	-.44 [*] (18)
Funding Agency	-.13 (52)	.68 (16)	-.28 [*] (37)	.68 ^{***} (19)	1.00 ^{****} (52)	.14 (43)	-.15 (38)	-.25 (38)
Larger Organi- zation	-.24 [*] (71)	.17 (16)	-.01 (45)	.17 (19)	.14 (43)	1.00 ^{****} (71)	-.19 (55)	-.18 (56)

* Indicates (p .05).

** Indicates (p .01).

*** Indicates (p .001).

**** Indicates (p .000).

Parenthesized figures are raw data.

with their limited resources can only provide funds to a given level.

A positive mild relationship exists between income size and dependency upon agency generated income, thus large agencies also tend to be more financially independent. As would be expected, reliance on outside generated income is highly negatively correlated with agency generated income. Perhaps one explanation for this phenomenon is that agencies which are able to generate their own incomes are able to decrease their reliance upon outside sources. Linked to this notion is the possibility that outside sources may be unwilling to provide income to agencies which are able to support themselves. Included within this outside generated component are several funding sources: government, private, funding agency, and larger organization, all of which display substantial negative correlations with agency generated income dependency.

Dependency upon government funding is substantially and negatively correlated with reliance upon funding agencies and private income sources. Several points can be made here. First, the government may well have public agencies offering this same service which gives little reason for public funds being given to private social services. Second, the government may indeed have different interests than the private welfare social service system, and therefore prefer to sponsor different programs than these. Another possibility is that private social services may have options about their income

Sources, and the government funds and private funds are viewed as interchangeable alternatives.

This is particularly interesting to note in light of the fact that reliance on funding agencies and larger organizations tend to display negative, although small correlations with income size. This may well indicate that agencies with funds to distribute may well seek out small agencies which are not receiving other sources of funding, such as heavy public funding. Thus, in their degrees of funding reliance on various income sources, agencies may be presented with options. It may well be that the individual private social service agencies view private and public funds as alternatives to each other. The most important conclusion which these low correlations would indicate is that there are a great many options open to social service agencies for funding, and it is more than likely that agencies opt for some mixture of these resources.

The intent of Table 17 is to indicate the relationships between dependency upon certain funding sources with the community characteristics of the area in which the social service agency is located. Some fairly consistent patterns tend to emerge from the data within this table. First, a negative relationship exists between agencies with high reliance upon outside generated income and high levels of education. This may well be interpreted in several manners. It is possible that outside income is going to those agencies located in areas of greatest need, presumably the poorer areas with

TABLE 17

CORRELATION COEFFICIENTS OF FUNDING RELIANCE PROPORTIONS WITH CHARACTERISTICS
OF THE COMMUNITY AREA IN WHICH THE AGENCY IS LOCATED

Community Charac- teristics	Outside	Private	Larger Organi- zation	Funding Agency	Government	Agency Gener- ated	Earned
Median School Years Completed	-.30	0.0	-.07	.16	-.13	.16	.09
Median Income Level	-.20	.07	-.14	.18	-.06	-.01	-.06
Percent American Indian	.08	.15	-.06	-.09	-.01	-.04	-.03
Percent Negro	.05	.05	-.01	-.04	-.04	-.04	-.00
Percent Hispanic	.23	-.02	.19	-.04	.16	-.15	-.13
Percent Other	.17	.08	.14	-.17	.07	-.02	-.08
Percent 25-64 Years	-.23	.03	-.17	.18	-.05	-.00	-.05
Percent Over 65 Years	-.15	.08	-.16	.16	-.04	.01	-.03
Percent Under 20 Years	.22	-.05	.17	-.16	.08	-.02	.03
Percent Under 20 and Over 65 Years	.25	-.04	.17	-.15	.09	-.03	.03

Table 17

CORRELATION COEFFICIENTS OF FUNDING RELIANCE PROPORTIONS WITH CHARACTERISTICS
OF THE COMMUNITY AREA IN WHICH THE AGENCY IS LOCATED

Community Charac- teristics	Outside	Private	Larger Organi- zation	Funding Agency	Government	Agency Gener- ated	Earned
Percent Below Poverty Line	-.08	-.14	-.11	-.01	.01	-.09	-.18
Percent Over 65 Years in Poverty	.08	-.19	-.04	-.00	.00	-.16	-.14
Percent Unemployed	-.29	.05	-.21 [*]	.16	-.05	-.11	-.13
Percent Wage Income	.29	.09	.24 [*]	-.14	.05	.00	.12
Percent Social Security Income	.32	.20	.06	.05	.05	.03	.08
Percent Public Assistance Income	.11	-.11	.02	-.16	.02	-.02	.02
Other Income	.00	.12	.05	.08	-.00	.10	.08
N of Cases	16	19	71	52	54	70	71

* Indicates that (p .05).

relatively low levels of education.

Educational and income levels are indications of certain standards of socioeconomic status. It may well be that those areas which are high in these indices are more likely to be able to elicit fee paying clients from their local populations, and therefore, are less reliant upon outside generated forms of income. The converse of this argument is that those areas which display an indication of socioeconomic dependency (economically disadvantaged areas) cannot rely upon fee paying clients, and therefore they are characterized by high proportions of outside generated income.

Relatively low correlations appear to occur throughout the body of the table. The interpretation offered is that because of the variety of funding sources available, it is possible that social service agencies utilize mixtures, and therefore do not display any high reliance upon any one source of funding.

Agencies located in areas with minority populations tend to receive income from varied sources. Agencies with relatively high proportions of Indian and black clientele do not appear to be receiving very much in the way of public funding, or for that matter, very much in the way of private funding. The Hispanic population does appear to be doing the best of all minorities in that social service agencies located within areas with large Hispanic populations tend to have mild but positive relationships with outside funding. Social service agencies located in Hispanic commun-

ities tend to be receiving some support from other organizations. Perhaps it might help to explain this relationship if we consider Hispanics to be the latest ethnic group to arrive at minority status. Hispanics may be the most fashionable minority to help to provide social services for at the present.

The data indicate there is a negative correlation between the age dependency populations and reliance on nearly all income sources, with the exception of reliance upon funding agencies. A partial explanation for this relationship may be that fund raising organizations promise that contributed money will remain in the community. In that case, reliance on income from funding agencies will occur for agencies located in areas where the people are most likely to be able to be less dependent, such as areas with relatively low proportions of age dependent populations. Proportions of money which flow into the areas with large age dependency proportions from sources such as the government and larger organizations, however, are comparatively small. It is most striking to note that the areas with large proportions of impoverished elderly tend to do quite poorly with all funding sources. A small proportion of the income for the social services located in areas which house this particular population appear to be coming from outside sources. There is little reliance on government sources in these areas. Either the government is sponsoring its own programs for areas with problems such as large proportions of impoverished elderly, or

the plight of the elderly has not yet captured the attention of public policy makers.

Agencies located in areas of high unemployment do not tend to receive income from funding agencies. Although confusing, this suggests several alternatives. Funding agencies may recognize unemployment as a very pressing problem and therefore are willing to support the social service located in areas with high unemployment rates in the hopes of reducing the strain placed upon these areas by the high level of unemployment. Another possibility is that funding agencies are channeling funding into areas with high rates of unemployment in the hopes of promoting workfare types of programs for the areas with high unemployment rates.

In conclusion, it may well be that no substantial relationships are to be found between the funding reliance proportions and community characteristics of social service agency locations. Any relationships which do emerge tend to be of a relatively small magnitude.

Table 18 shows the relationships between an important characteristic of the agencies, the degree of institutionalization which they exhibit, and their dependency on certain funding sources. A substantial positive relation exists between the size of the annual income and the degree of institutionalization, thus the larger the agency, the more institutionalized it is. A mild positive relation exists between income from a funding agency and the degree of institutionalization. This may not be surprising when interpreted

TABLE 18

CORRELATION COEFFICIENTS BETWEEN THE DEGREE OF
INSTITUTIONALIZATION OF A SOCIAL SERVICE AGENCY AND THE
DEGREE OF RELIANCE UPON VARIOUS SOURCES OF FUNDING

Funding Sources	Degree of Institu- tionalization	N of Cases
Outside Generated	-.21	54
Private	.19	19
Funding Agency	.29*	52
Larger Organization	-.19	71
Private	.19	19
Government	-.21	54
Agency Generated	.21*	70
Earned	.10	71
Income (natural logarithm)	.57**	93

* Indicates (p .05).

** Indicates (p .01).

in the light of the rather stringent requirements which funding agencies set up prior to doling out financial support for social service agencies. The relationship between reliance on agency generated income and the degree of institutionalization might well be interpreted to mean that the two processes are simultaneously operating. Over a period of time, as social service agencies become more institutionalized, they are also acquiring the means for generating their own income.

The mild negative correlation between reliance on income from a larger organization and the degree of institutionalization might be explained by the fact that some smaller social service agencies tend to "belong" in a sense to the larger organization. It may be a case that newer programs appear as the perceived need for them arises, and these agencies display a relatively low level of institutionalization due to their relative newness and dependency on their larger organization for funding and administration.

The mild negative relationship between outside generated income and the degree of institutionalization might well tie in with the argument about the sequential process of acquiring degrees of institutionalization and relative independence in being able to self generate proportions of the funding. The mild negative relationship between the governmental funding and the degrees of institutionalization may well reflect the possibility that the government is one of the first sources of potential funding for newer agencies

with lesser degrees of institutionalization.

The vulnerability of private social services is indicated by the heavy reliance upon outside generated income, as compared to the proportion of agency generated income. Possibly public and private funding are viewed as interchangeable options by the private social service agencies. Mixtures of funding appear to be more popular than reliance upon any one particular source, although there are favorite sources of funding, most notably governmental and funding agencies sources.

DISCUSSION

Complexity and Interdependence

This study has attempted to understand data on social service agencies in Chicago within the framework of a loosely structured system of social services.

Because of the disproportionate geographic distribution of social service agencies, it is suspected that at least for those areas containing relatively fewer of the social service agencies, the approach toward social welfare tend to be of an ad hoc nature, with a reactive rather than curative orientation. This hypothesis is based upon the fact that many areas with large pockets of poverty and its attendant problems do not yet contain social services in proportion to the magnitude of their problems.

Wilensky and LeBeaux have argued that there is a great deal of interdependency between social service agencies. The data here indicate a picture of interdependency between social service agencies, particularly in the areas of funding, exchange of services, and information and referral.

Wilensky indicates that there is an interplay between policy, implementation, and the social services. An example of this occurs in a cost effectiveness analysis. As suggested by a television commercial for a fund raising organization which stresses that a small portion of one's

daily pay one may contribute to the significant accomplishments of various social service agencies. (This is generally followed by a listing of their accomplishments.) In this case there is an implicit relationship between social service fund raising, social service performance, and social service spending. The purpose here seems to be to instill a perception of need, to demonstrate how the social services will fill this need, and to suggest that an individual may contribute to this fulfillment.

According to Greenley, social services are frequently organized on the basis of a perceived need. The data here support this argument, indicating some discrepancy between the actual needs of a neighborhood and the social services which are located within the community area. One example of this would be the North Lakefront region which contains nearly sixty percent of the city's total number of social service agencies, while housing a much smaller proportion than that of the city's total population. Other areas stand in relative deprivation concerning their proportionate share of social services, the primary example being the south side.

To explain the orientations of the social services, a pluralistic interpretation of competing minority groups is frequently proposed. The data support this argument in that the founding dates indicate that the up and coming minority group appears to be Hispanics, who receive greater proportions of those agencies which have minority orientations. The more recent the establishment of the social service agency, the

more likely it is to serve Hispanics. Minority oriented agencies with older founding dates are generally oriented to blacks or all minorities. Some funding data, particularly the patterns set by outside income, government, and larger organizational reliance proportions lend support to this interpretation.

The principle of private familial responsibility has been implicit in the provision of social welfare since the last century. Based upon the relationships between minority groups and social services such as job training, employment, and adult education, an alternative explanation is offered. Thus should familial responsibility prove inadequate in coping with pervasive social problems, the principle of self help and pulling oneself up by one's own bootstraps would be the next logical step in a progression of social service offerings.

Possibly this conservative emphasis is reflected in the patterns of sponsorship of the social service agencies such as the hypothesized links between welfare policy, social service programs, welfare spending, and service delivery, although indications of such relations may not be arrived at directly.

Coordination and Structure

The linkages between complexity, interdependency, and policy implementation are best exemplified within

the localized fragmentation and overlapping of agencies and services shown in this sample. One demonstration of the degree of overlap is that throughout the data set, social service agencies in close proximity to each other are performing the same types of social services. This is the case for all three religious denominations examined, particularly within the North Lakefront region, and particularly in family, socialization, and community advocacy services. The degree of overlap is increased when the nondenominational social services are included.

Pearce and Street indicate that the social services are increasingly striving for greater coordination and consolidation. The greatest evidence of this phenomena occurs within two areas in this sample: large scale organized funding such as the United Way, and information and referral services. An example of coordination is the downtown location of the large scale administrative offices and headquarters of the larger federations. Strong federations tend to provide coordinating functions for the individualized services in the various locations. Another indication of coordination is that agencies tend to take on the characteristics of their fellow federation members. Also examples of coordination lie in the large number of branch offices and affiliations indicated by this data set. The very fact that social service agencies are aware of other social service agencies indicates some minimal level of coordination, probably within the realm of information and referral.

These results seem to indicate the presence of a large scale centralized, but loose coordination of autonomously operating decentralized social service agencies. This is particularly true of the large scale umbrella organizations such as Hull House organizations and United Charities. Publications may well provide a means of communication linkages between various agencies, the various federations, and financial contributors. Both publications and endorsements appear to be linked to the relations between agencies, particularly among federations and agencies with branch offices.

The Match Between Target Populations and the Social Services

Pearce and Street find complex ecological differentiation among the social services. This sample indicates striking patterns of geographic dispersion. In a comparison with all the social services listed within the Social Services Directory, evidence of the representativeness of this sample is indicated.¹ The Lakefront exhibits patterns of greater variety and concentration of social services. While the entire

¹A map was constructed to compare the distribution of social services within this data set with those listed within the Social Services Directory. A visual inspection indicates that this data set appears to be a reasonably accurate sampling of the city's private social services. The Social Services Directory was utilized because it is believed to be the most comprehensive listing of the Chicago private social services.

South Side regions show a tendency to group along the Lakefront also, it is especially noteworthy that for the most part, these areas display relative deprivation of social services. The predominant pattern of concern for the North Lakefront and the entire South Side is with the family. The West Side areas of the city indicate a concern with community advocacy, probably linked to the fact that this is Chicago's poverty stricken "Black Belt," and therefore requires community advocacy and organization programs.

The mismatch is most evident in the fact that concentration of Chicago's income and basic needs services are within the North Lakefront, although these areas, do not display nearly as high an index of economic disadvantage as the southern and western regions of Chicago.

Pearce and Street propose that the secularization of social services is linked to a decline of white ethnicity as a social force. The results indicate that some agencies might well be vestiges of earlier times. An example of this would be the number of Jewish oriented social services in Hyde Park. Although there is a sizeable Jewish population in the area at present, it is possible that with the passing of time, the area will become increasingly more populated by blacks. Therefore, those organizations with this orientation will either have to decrease, relocate, or change orientations to maintain match with the population trends. The suspicion is that this outcome is largely dependent on the effect that the development of prime lakefront real

estate will have upon the population distribution. Condominium conversions and urban redevelopment may well promote a reverse flow of the white middle class population.

Pearce and Street show a decline in characteristic specific social services. The results of this study support this notion since very few agencies tend to be specific about their target populations, with the logical exceptions of services for the mentally retarded and rehabilitation. A possible explanation of this phenomenon is competition for funding. Agencies which indicate service to the community at large may be somewhat more able to appeal to various funding options, and therefore, more likely to obtain funding, grants, fees, and contracts. Those agencies which indicate some degree of specialization within their target populations tend to exhibit mismatch. An example of this is that almost all of the youth oriented social services are concentrated in the North Lakefront, while there are indications of much larger proportions of youths in other community areas.

Dramatic withdrawals of the social services from certain regions are described by Pearce and Street. This study complements their conclusions by showing large areas void of services. Because of this maldistribution, it would appear that private social services are not following a credo of service to the most needy. Evidence of the mismatch is greatest in areas with high concentrations of social services, such as the North Lakefront, which contains the Loop, being adjacent to the community area Near South Side, which

contains very few social service agencies.

If there truly is a tendency for agencies to exist in close proximity to each other, it is unlikely that in the absence of greater regulation, this pattern of regional concentration and absence of social service organizations will be changed. The only hope for areas such as the Near South Side to obtain private social services may lie in progressive spillage from the areas with more social services. Most areas with few social services appear to be located close to areas similar to themselves, with very few agencies to provide the spillover. The effects of the development of lakefront property may redistribute the poverty population to areas (farther west) which are wholly unprepared to deal with these problems, in so far as private social services are concerned.

Although the data indicate that in terms of orientation, blacks are the preferred minority group, and the largest minority group, this may well be a vestige of earlier times, because orientation reflects the organization's philosophies, and therefore, to some extent, perceived needs. Theoretically, blacks are well matched in that they are the largest minority and have the largest number of minority oriented agencies dedicated to them. Considering funding and regional locations, Hispanics appear to be fast becoming the preferred minority population, because needs and services are best matched in Hispanic communities. Therefore, it might be said that explicit ethnic and racial orientations of

agencies are of a theoretical nature, while better degrees of matching might well be indicated through the actual distribution of the agencies and the actual funding patterns.

The issues of perceived need and actual need can help to determine whether an actual match exists between the perceived needs and the actual needs. The Hispanic oriented agencies appear to demonstrate the best match in the areas of perceived need and actual need (the actual proportion of Hispanics in the area.) The Jewish oriented agencies appear to be the best matched regarding the location of the Jewish people. The best example of match may well be the case of age orientation. In terms of age orientations, youths appear to be doing the best in overall proportions. When considering age distributions among service regions, the degree of match is greatest for the senior citizen population. The data appear to indicate a great deal of mismatch for youths, but social service agencies claim proportionately greater orientations toward youths. One interpretation for this may be that because so many social service agencies are located in the North Lakefront, that mismatches are inevitable. It may, however, tie in with Cook's argument that support for welfare groups is based on the perceived need of the group, their pleasantness, and their gratefulness. Support for welfare groups may also depend on their relative organization as a pressure group.

Although the index of dissimilarity indicates gross

mismatch between areas and the social services within them for both the population as a whole and the poverty population, there are some social services which appear to be better distributed than others, particularly employment agencies. This may reflect the notion of self help ideology in private social services. As a whole, however, the data presented indicate gross mismatch among the private social services in terms of region, target population, orientation, and to some extent funding.

Relationships of Support

It is hypothesized that there is a relationship of interdependency and the degree of match exhibited between the social services. Cook gives evidence of a differentiating public who discriminate in terms of support to welfare groups in terms of the services linked to them. This may reflect the desire to maximize independence through self help types of services.

Cook's data indicate a preference for the elderly. The data here demonstrate this preference, showing support in areas with large proportions of elderly. This may well be linked to the public's growing perception of the special needs of the elderly. These are, however, as with all of the data, very small correlations, and therefore it is somewhat premature to draw upon any generalizations, using this basic data.

Elling argues that agencies are frequently dependent upon the varying abilities of the community to provide support.

In support of this, the data indicate that economically disadvantaged areas rely somewhat disproportionately on outside income for the funding of their social services. This may be connected to the probability that such agencies cannot expect to serve fee paying clients as do agencies in more well to do areas.

There is an extraordinarily indistinct line between private and public funding, and (particularly in) the areas of referral and information. The distinction may well be unnecessary, since private and public social service relationships may prove to exist in a relationship of interdependency.

The data in this study, in contrast to that of Pearce and Street, indicate that private social services are more reliant upon outside funding sources, especially the government. The data suggest that agencies view government funding and private funding as alternatives. The relatively low all around correlations indicate that individual social service agencies are unlikely to rely exclusively upon any one source, but tend to utilize some mixture to provide the total outside generated income.

In conclusion, the major findings of this study, especially the interrelationships of funding and matching, are that the overall patterns of the social service agencies appear to repeat the patterns of the larger social service system. The data indicate the lack of fit between need and attention from the private social service sector, which may be linked to the issue of perceived need. Other factors,

such as those enumerated by Cook, play important but subsidiary parts. Theory and logic would dictate that a greater degree of match is called for than the data here indicate.

REFERENCES

- 1974 Adams, Paul A., and Nancy F. McDonald, "Clinical Cooling Out of Poor People," The Sociology of American Poverty, Ed. Joan Huber, Peter Chalfant, Cambridge: Schenkman Publishing Company, p. 256-264.
- 1972 Beasley, Lou M., "A Beginning Attempt to Eradicate Racist Attitudes," Social Casework, 53, 1, Jan., p. 9-13.
- 1972 Bremner, Robert H., From the Depths: The Discovery of Poverty in the United States, New York: New York University Press.
- 1965 Cloward, Richard, and I. Epstein, "Private Social Welfare's Disengagement from the Poor: The Case of Family Adjustment Agencies," Social Welfare Institutions, Ed. M. N. Zald, New York: John Wiley and Sons, p. 623-644.
- 1979 Cook, Fay Lomax, Who Should Be Helped?, Beverly Hills: Sage Publications.
- 1971 Daniels, Robert S., "The Future of Medical Care Delivery Systems," Social Service Review, 45, 3, Sept., p. 259-273.
- 1965 Elling, Ray H., and Sandor Halebsky, "Support for Public and Private Services," Social Welfare Institu-

REFERENCES

- tions: A Sociological Reader, Ed. M. N. Zald, New York: John Wiley and Sons, p. 311-330.
- 1973 Freeman, Howard E., and Wyatt C. Jones, Social Problems: Causes and Control, Rand McNally College Publishing Company, Second Edition.
- 1972 Gilette, Arthur, "Aims and Organization of Voluntary Service by Youths," Community Development Journal, 7, 2, April, p. 99-129.
- 1976 Gordon, Rose, "Approaches to the Analysis of Social Service Organizations," Journal of Social Policy, 5, 3, July, p. 225-238.
- 1973 Greenley, James, and Stuart A. Kirk, "Organizational Characteristics of Agencies and the Distribution of Services of Applicants," Journal of Health and Social Behavior, 14, 1, March, p. 70-79.
- 1957- Janowitz, Morris, and W. Delaney, "The Bureaucrat
1958 and the Public: A Study of Informational Perspectives," Administrative Science Quarterly, 2, Summer, p. 141-162.
- 1975 Jones, Terry, "Thoughts on the Coordination of Services," Social Work, 20, 5, Sept, p. 275-378.
- 1976 Karl, Barry D., "Philanthropy, Policy Planning, and the Bureaucratization of the Democratic Ideal," Daedalus, 105, 4, Fall, p. 129-149.

REFERENCES

- 1971 Knoll, Faustina Ramirez, "Casework Services for Mexican Americans," Social Casework, 52, 5, May, p. 279-284.
- 1969 Lowi, Theodore J., The End of Liberalism: Ideology, Policy, and the Crisis of Public Authority, New York: W. W. Norton and Company, Inc.
- 1975 Magil, Robert S., and Terry N. Clark, "Community Power and Decision Making: Recent Research and Its Policy Implications," Social Service Review, 49, 1, March, p. 33-45.
- 1972 Manino, Fortune V., and Milton F. Shore, "Ecologically Oriented Family Intervention," Family Process, 11, 4, December, p. 499-505.
- 1973 McCartney, Kenneth H., "Social Services: Idealism, Power, and Money," Smith College Studies in Social Work, 44, 1, November, p. 1-13.
- 1972 McKinlay, John B., "Some Approaches and Problems in the Study of the Use of Services-An Overview," Journal of Health and Social Behavior, 13, 2, June, p. 115-152.
- 1961 Merton, Robert K., and Robert A. Nisbet, Contemporary Social Problems, New York: Harcourt, Brace, and World.
- 1973 Orden, Susan R., "The Impact of Community Action Pro-

REFERENCES

- grams on Private Social Service Agencies," Social Problems, 20, 3, Winter, p. 364-381.
- 1978 Pearce, Diana, and David Street, unpublished manuscript, later published under title: "Welfare and Metropolitan Areas," Handbook of Contemporary Life, Ed. David Street, San Francisco: Jossey Bass Publishers, p. 319-351.
- 1965 Perrow, Charles, "Organizational Prestige: Some Functions and Dysfunctions," Social Welfare Institutions: A Sociological Reader, Ed. Mayer N. Zald, New York: John Wiley and Sons, p. 331-340.
- 1965 Ross, Aileen D., "Philanthropic Activity and the Business Career," Social Welfare Institutions: A Sociological Reader, Ed. M. N. Zald, New York: John Wiley and Sons, p. 341-352.
- 1975 Stout, Janis P., "Charity and the Redemption of Urban Society in American Popular Fiction Before 1860," Research Studies, 43, 3, Sept., p. 162-174.
- 1975- Vaid, K. N., "Urban Social Services: Some Issues
1976 for Research," Indian Journal of Social Work, 36, 3-4, October-January, p. 377-383.
- 1975 Wilensky, Harold L., The Welfare State and Equality: Structural Roots of Public Expenditures, Los Angeles: University of California Press.

REFERENCES

- 1965 Wilensky, Harold L., and Charles N. LeBeaux, Industrial Society and Social Welfare, New York: Free Press.

APPROVAL SHEET

The thesis submitted by Karen S. Hansen
has been read and approved by the following committee:

Dr. Kirsten Grønberg
Professor, Loyola

Dr. Judith Wittner
Professor, Loyola

The final copies have been examined by the director of the thesis and the signature which appears below verifies the fact that any necessary changes have been incorporated and that the thesis is now given final approval by the Committee with references to content and form.

The thesis is therefore accepted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Arts in Sociology.

March 30, 1980
Date

Kirsten S. Grønberg
Director's Signature